DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

for

803 Waimanu Street

Approved by the

HAWAII COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
461 Cooke Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

on

January 8, 2014

Pursuant to Chapter 206E, Hawaii Revised Statutes

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO.: KAK 13-091
I. PROJECT SUMMARY AND ENTITLEMENTS

Refer to the attached Table 1, Project Summary and Entitlements, as Exhibit A.

II. RESERVED HOUSING

The Applicant shall comply with the provisions of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title 15, Subtitle 4, Chapter 218, and Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules. The Applicant shall designate no less than twenty percent (20%) of the residential units in the Project as reserved housing units for purchase or rental according to income requirements and qualifying conditions established by Subchapter 3 of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules.

The Applicant may submit a reserved housing credit program for additional reserved housing credit for the Authority’s consideration at a later time.

The Applicant shall execute an agreement with the HCDA as to how the Project conforms to the provisions of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules and such agreement shall be binding upon the Applicant and any successors in interest. No construction of the Project shall commence unless the Applicant has provided satisfactory documentation to the HCDA that the Project conforms to the provision of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules.

III. INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

Infrastructure improvements can be divided into two categories: (1) infrastructure improvements or requirements which are immediately necessary to proceed with the Project; and (2) improvements which are necessary to improve and upgrade the vicinity in total through the HCDA District-Wide Improvement Program.

A. Improvements Necessary to Proceed with the Project: With regard to infrastructure improvements or requirements which are necessary to proceed with the Project, the Applicant shall be responsible for providing necessary developer improvements.

B. Improvements Proposed for the HCDA District-Wide Infrastructure Improvement Program: As part of the HCDA District-Wide Improvement Program, road and utility improvements are being undertaken in increments throughout the Kakaako District, financed in part through an Improvement District Program.

In this regard, the Project shall be subject to assessments for its pro rata share of the cost of improvements which may, in the future, be necessarily undertaken in the vicinity of the respective projects under the HCDA or other government agencies’ improvement
programs. The Project will be assessed under the same methods and in the same manner as other properties in the area.

In order to ensure the participation of the Project, the Applicant, and its successors and assigns, shall agree to participate in the HCDA District-Wide Improvement Program at the time said program is implemented. The terms specified in the agreement shall be made a part of all condominium and conveyance documents for the Project and said documents shall be reviewed and approved by the HCDA prior to submission to the Real Estate Commission and execution.

IV. DECISION

The staff report for the Development Permit application dated January 8, 2014 is hereby incorporated into this Development Permit and made part of this Permit. The Development Permit for the Project is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:

A. Provide a Development Agreement with the HCDA that binds the Applicant, and its successors and assigns, individually and collectively, to develop and to maintain the Project site in conformity with the provisions of this Development Permit and with the Mauka Area Rules. This Agreement shall be recorded as a covenant running with the land with the Bureau of Conveyances or the Assistant Registrar of the Land Court. Proof of such recordation in the form of copies of the covenants certified by the appropriate agency shall be submitted to the HCDA.

B. Comply with all applicable requirements of Subchapter 2 (Regulating Plan and Neighborhood Zone) of the Mauka Area Rules.

C. Comply with all applicable requirements of Subchapter 3 (Thoroughfare Plan and Standards) of the Mauka Area Rules.

D. Comply with all applicable requirements of Subchapter 4 (Area-Wide Standards) of the Mauka Area Rules.

E. Comply with all applicable requirements of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules, Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title 15, Subtitle 4, Chapter 218.

F. Comply with all requirements as specified under Parts I., II. and III. of this Permit.
G. Conduct an Archaeological Inventory Survey that is acceptable to Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Division prior to HCDA approval of the initial building permit for the Project. Comply with all Conditions imposed by the Authority with respect to any Historic Properties, Aviation Artifacts or a burial site that may be discovered at the Project site.

H. Comply with any other terms and conditions as required by the HCDA Executive Director to implement the purpose and intent of the Rules.

All conditions shall be met prior to the issuance of the initial Building Permit for the Project.

Dated at Honolulu, Hawaii, this 8th day of January, 2014.

HAWAII COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, State of Hawaii

By

Brian Lee, Chairperson

Attachment: Exhibit A - Table 1, Project Summary and Entitlements
# I. PROJECT SUMMARY AND ENTITLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mauka Area Rules</th>
<th>Required/Allowable</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Zone and Land Use</td>
<td>HAR §15-217-23(a)(2) Neighborhood Zones, Figure 1.2 Regulating Plan, Figure 1.9 Land Use</td>
<td>Central Kakaako (&quot;CK&quot;)</td>
<td>CK housing project</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules; residential use is permitted in all zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Oahu TMKs: 2-1-049: 50, 70 and 72 21,192 SF</td>
<td>See Project Plans Sheet A-1.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Figures 1.3 &amp; NZ.5 D Building Form, Maximum Density</td>
<td>21,192 SF (Site Area) x 3.5 FAR = 74,172 allowable SF; Reserved Housing (&quot;RH&quot;) excluded from floor area calculation, per §15-218-18(1).</td>
<td>71,012 SF, excluding floor area for RH. RH floor area is 17,994 SF.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules; see Sheet A-1.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reserved Housing                | HAR §15-218-17(a) | At least 20% of the total residential floor area to be allocated for RH units (i.e., 17,896 SF in this project). | Excluded floor area for RH is 17,994 SF. | Project conforms to Rules; see Sheet A-1.2.  
Applicant may submit a separate proposal for additional reserved housing credit to the Authority at a later time for its consideration. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mauka Area Rules</th>
<th>Required/Allowable</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height</td>
<td>Figures 1.3 &amp; NZ.5.1</td>
<td>65 FT from “Ground Elevation”, excluding rooftop mechanical room (Block 24 on map).</td>
<td>65 FT from “Ground Elevation”, excluding rooftop mechanical room and stair(s).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Figures 1.3 &amp; NZ.5 A Building Types, and BT-8 Urban Block</td>
<td>Urban Block</td>
<td>Urban Block</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Types</td>
<td>Figures 1.3 &amp; NZ.5 B Frontage Types</td>
<td>Stoop; Dooryard; Terrace Front; Forecourt; Shopfront; Chinatown Shopfront; Kakaako Frontage</td>
<td>Stoop frontage on both frontages, as allowed in Figure FT-2.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Occupancy</td>
<td>Figure 1.3 Building Placement Frontage Occupancy at Build-to-Line</td>
<td>No build-to-line specified at Kawaiahao and Waimanu frontages, but requirement is 75% occupancy if build-to-line were required.</td>
<td>Project places frontage at property line on both the Waimanu and Kawaiahao frontages; ground level contains about 75% occupancy by active uses.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Mauka Area Rules</td>
<td>Required/Allowable</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Placement</td>
<td>Figure NZ.5 CK and Figure NZ.5-1</td>
<td>Build-to-lines at Waimanu and Kawaihao – Not Specified Side and Rear Setbacks – 0 FT</td>
<td>Building built to property line except for recessed “stoops” at levels R-1 and R-1.5 areas at Waimanu and Kawaihao frontages (see Sheet A-1.2).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Plate</td>
<td>Table BT-8.1, Maximum Floor Plate Ratios for Urban Block buildings</td>
<td>100% lot coverage allowed on floors 1 through 4 (21,192 SF in this project); average of 60% coverage on floors 5 through 7.</td>
<td>20,229 SF on Levels R-2; 12,136 SF (average 60%) on Levels R5 through R7 (see Sheet A-1.2 and A-3.1).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Figure BT.8 Urban Block E. Open Space</td>
<td>15% of Site Area = 3,179 SF 40 FT minimum dimension.</td>
<td>8,477 SF, with 40 FT Dimension on R2 and R5 (i.e., 3,148 SF on R2 and 2,953 SF + 2376 SF on R5).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Space</td>
<td>§15-217-56 Landscape and Recreation Space</td>
<td>55 SF of recreation space per dwelling; 55 SF x 153 dwellings = 8,415 SF in this project; if outdoors, may be used to satisfy open space requirements.</td>
<td>8,477 SF, with 40 FT Dimension on R2 and R5 (i.e., 3,148 SF on R2 and 2,953 SF + 2376 SF on R5).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules. See Sheet A-1.2 and L-1.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Mauka Area Rules</td>
<td>Required/Allowable</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>§15-217-63(e)(2) §15-218-18(a)(3) §15-218-55(b)</td>
<td>No off-street parking required in CK zone, but RH requires 1 parking stall per unit; 24 RH units in this project.</td>
<td>91 parking stalls in multilevel unattended semi-automated mechanical parking including 24 parking stalls (12 standard and 12 compact) for the 24 RH units; see Sheets A-1.2 and A-2.1.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Loading</td>
<td>§15-217-63(l)(1) and (5) Loading Spaces</td>
<td>1 loading stall for 20,000-150,000 SF of floor area; one stall to have minimum dimensions of 12 FT x 35 FT and 14 FT vertical clearance.</td>
<td>1 handicap van loading space and 1 loading space with dimensions of 12 FT x 35 FT and 14 FT vertical clearance provided in garage; see Sheet A-2.1.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>§15-217-63(m) Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>Short- and long-term bicycle parking to be provided within 400 FT of building entrance 400 FT of building entrance. Front facades to have at least one encroaching element (e.g., porch, balcony) for at least 10% of facade.</td>
<td>Short-term bicycle parking provided. Short-term and long-term bicycle parking provided in parking garage on ground level of parking garage.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Mauka Area Rules</td>
<td>Required/Allowable</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Massing</td>
<td>Figure BT.8 H</td>
<td>Front facades to have at least one encroaching element (e.g., porch, balcony) for at least 10% of facade.</td>
<td>Plane break provided.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>§15-217-65(d)</td>
<td>4% of total residential floor area less RH (2,840 SF in this project).</td>
<td>866 SF provided in widened sidewalk along Kawaiahao frontage (see Sheet A-1.2 and A-2.1.).</td>
<td>Request for remaining requirement to be satisfied by payment of in lieu fee, per §15-217-65(d)(3) approved by the Authority at its January 8, 2014 Public Hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>§15-217-56 Landscape and Recreation Space; Figure 1.7 Street Tree Plan</td>
<td>Provide automatic irrigation system with rain or moisture sensor; no street trees required on Waimanu Street, but Tulipwood tree required on Kawaiahao Street.</td>
<td>For landscaped open space, automatic irrigation system with rain sensor control; two Tulipwood trees provide on Kawaiahao Street.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Building Standards</td>
<td>§15-217-59 Requirement for Green Building standards</td>
<td>Qualify for base LEED rating; document achievement of LEED points.</td>
<td>Project will meet base LEED rating.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules for basic certified standard; see LEED rating sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Mauka Area Rules</td>
<td>Required/Allowable</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Placement</td>
<td>Figure 1.10B Parking Placement Figure BT.8 Urban Block</td>
<td>Place parking with allowed parking zone, per map; upper floors of parking to be screened from view of the public frontage by a liner building or by landscaping, green screens or cladding.</td>
<td>Parking placed within allowed parking zone; ground floor parking concealed by liner of habitable space on Levels R-1 and R-1.5.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Access</td>
<td>§15-217-63(c)(3) Figures 1.14 and PZ.5</td>
<td>Curb cuts shall be set back a minimum of 22 FT from adjacent properties.</td>
<td>Driveways are more than 22 FT from side property lines on both frontages (see Sheet A-2.1).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Zone Treatment</td>
<td>Figures 1.14 and PZ.5</td>
<td>Pedestrian Zone width standards: Waimanu Street (service street) sidewalk to have 6-foot wide Throughway; Kawaiaha Street (street) sidewalk to have 2-foot wide Frontage, 6-foot wide Throughway, and 5-foot wide Furnishing zones.</td>
<td>Pedestrian Zone on Waimanu frontage to retain existing improvements, except for relocation of driveway curb cut; Kawaiaha frontage improved to conform to prescribed Pedestrian Zone standards.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules; see Sheet L-1.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REQUEST
KAK 13-091: 803 WAIMANU STREET
Staff Report, Findings and Recommendations
January 8, 2014

I. REQUEST
MJF Development Corporation (“Applicant”) is requesting a Development Permit to demolish existing single-story industrial buildings and construct a new residential project (“Project”). The Project site is located at 803 Waimanu Street and 764 Kawaiahao Street in the Mauka Area of the Kakaako Community Development District (“KCDD”) (Tax Map Key Nos. (“TMKs”): 2-1-049: 050, 070, and 072). The Applicant’s Development Permit application was provided to the Authority at its public hearing on November 6, 2013.

II. PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH
A public hearing notice for the Project was published in the Honolulu Star-Advertiser on October 6, 2013. In accordance with the provisions of Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”) §206E-5.6, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives were notified upon posting of the public hearing notice. Association of apartment owners of residential buildings adjacent to the Project, surrounding landowners and businesses, the Ala Moana/Kakaako Neighborhood Board, and the Kakaako Improvement Association were specially notified of the public hearings. Various elected officials and State and County agencies were also notified of the public hearings. Public hearing notice was also provided to approximately 321 individuals and organizations that have shown interest in development in Kakaako in the past and who have requested that they be kept informed of development activities in the district.

HCDA staff encouraged the Applicant to present the Project to the Ala Moana/Kakaako Neighborhood Board, and the Project was presented at the October 22, 2013 Neighborhood Board meeting.

III. STATE AND COUNTY AGENCIES CONSULTATION
Section 15-217-57 requires that adequate infrastructure be determined for development in the Central Kakaako (“CK”) neighborhood zone. Project application materials were provided to the following State and County agencies for review and comment on September 24, 2013:
State of Hawaii

- Department of Transportation – Airports Divisions (“DOT”),
- Department of Land and Natural Resources - State Historic Preservation Division (“SHPD”), and
- Department of Education (“DOE”).

City and County of Honolulu (“City”)

- Department of Transportation Services (“DTS”),
- Department of Planning and Permitting (“DPP”),
- Board of Water Supply (“BWS”), and
- Department of Environmental Services (“DES”).

The HCDA received comments from the BWS, the DOT, and the DPP which were provided to the Authority at its public hearing on November 6, 2013. The BWS provided comments stating that the existing water system was adequate to accommodate the proposed Project. The DOT provided comments that the proposed structure would be below the approach for the Honolulu International Airport. The DPP provided comments which highlighted the benefits and opportunities for the Project’s location and proposed density for accessible housing in the urban core, and in close proximity of the rail corridor.

The Applicant has submitted a sewer connection application for the Project that has been approved by the DPP, Wastewater Branch, which was provided to the Authority at its public hearing on November 6, 2013.

A meeting among HCDA staff, the Applicant, and City and State agencies was scheduled on October 24, 2013.

The Applicant has submitted a traffic impact assessment report (TIAR) for the Project and is provided hereto as Exhibit A, which recommends one-way driveway access, restricted on-street parking, and continuation of sidewalks fronting the Project site. The TIAR does not recommend any refiguring of traffic patterns or signalization. The proposed Project already provides for the recommendations made in the TIAR.

IV. DESIGN REVIEW

As provided by §15-217-80(f) of the Mauka Area Rules a Design Advisory Board (“DAB”) was convened to review the Development Permit application and provide comments. The DAB included the following members:
Mr. Deepak Neupane, P.E., AIA (HCDA Director of Planning and Development),
Ms. Lois Mitsunaga, (HCDA Board Member), and
Mr. Tom Schnell, AICP (professional expert and Kakaako resident).

Comments provided by the DAB were shared with the Applicant and was provided to the Authority at its public hearing on November 6, 2013. The Applicant responded positively to these comments and subsequently revised the proposed design, including “flipping” the building layout to step back away from the adjacent lower Imperial Plaza tower (Plaza Tower) to have the proposed development “face” the Plaza Tower and avoid a situation where a windowless exterior wall would be only ten (10) feet from the lanai of adjacent housing units.

V. COMPLETENESS REVIEW, AUTOMATIC APPROVAL, AND FILING FEES

In accordance with the provisions of §15-217-85(g) of the Mauka Area Rules, the Development Permit application was determined to be complete and a certificate of completeness was issued on September 23, 2013, and was provided to the Authority at its public hearing on November 6, 2013.

The purpose of the completeness review is to determine whether all required information is provided in a Development Permit application. A completeness review does not constitute a determination as to whether an application complies with the provisions of the Mauka Area Rules.

In accordance with the provisions of §15-217-86 of the Mauka Area Rules, the Development Permit application will be deemed approved if the Authority has not rendered a decision on the Development Permit application within 180 days from when it is determined to be complete and public hearing notice is published. The public hearing notice was published on October 6, 2013 thus establishing an automatic approval date of April 4, 2014.

Records indicate that all filing fees have been paid in accordance with the provisions of §15-217-93 of the Mauka Area Rules.

VI. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PROCEDURES

Pursuant to §15-217-80(c) and Figure 1.1 of the Mauka Area Rules, developments within the KCDD require a Development Permit that is subject to Authority review and approval. The HRS §206E-5.6 requires that when rendering a decision regarding the acceptance of a developer’s proposal to develop lands under the Authority’s
control, the Authority shall render its decision at a public hearing separate from the hearing at which the proposal was presented. This essentially requires that the Authority conduct two separate public hearings in rendering a decision regarding a Development Permit.

Section 15-217-80(d) of the Mauka Area Rules requires the following Findings of Fact in approving a Development Permit application:

A. **Consistency with the Mauka Area Plan:** That the Project complies with and advances the goals, policies and objectives of the Mauka Area Plan;

B. **Consistency with the Mauka Area Rules:** That the Project proposal will protect, preserve, or enhance desirable neighborhood characteristics through compliance with the standards and guidelines of the Mauka Area Rules; and

C. **Compatibility of the Mauka District:** That the Project proposal will not have a substantial adverse effect on the surrounding land uses and will be compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area.

**VII. ANALYSIS**

**Project Description**

The Project is proposed to be located on a 21,192 square foot (0.49 acres) development lot at 803 Waimanu Street and 764 Kawaiahao Street. The site is within the CK neighborhood zone and multi-family residential development is an allowable use within the neighborhood. The site currently includes single-story industrial buildings on the property occupied by tenants that are all associated with some form of automotive repair. The current tenants either have leases that expire no later than October 2013 or are on a month-to-month basis, and will vacate prior to construction. The Applicant plans to demolish the existing industrial buildings to construct the Project.

The Project consists of a 65-foot high 7-story structure containing 153 residential units, and will include a mix of studios, one- and two-bedroom units. The first floor of the structure includes residential units, lobby, utility and trash rooms. The second through seventh floors include residential units, and 8,477 square feet of recreation space provided on the second and fifth floors. A mechanized ground-floor parking system provides ninety-two (92) parking stalls, including fifty-one (51) standard size, forty (40) compact, and one (1) handicap van accessible stall.
Table 1: Project Summary

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Lot Area</td>
<td>21,192 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Floor Area</td>
<td>71,012 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved Housing Floor Area</td>
<td>17,994 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td>153 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>8,477 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Space</td>
<td>8,477 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
<td>20,229 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floorplate Ratio (5th Floor and Above)</td>
<td>60% (12,136 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>91 stalls (on-site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading</td>
<td>1 loading stall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Use, Density and Adequacy of Infrastructure

The Project is located within the CK neighborhood zone and proposes residential use, which is consistent with Figure 1.9 and §15-217-26 of the Mauka Area Rules.

The Project site is identified as TMKs: 2-1-049: 050, 070, and 072 and is 21,192 square feet in area. The Applicant is proposing a total residential floor area of 89,006 square feet. In accordance with §15-218-17(a) of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules, any multi-family residential development on lots greater than 20,000 gross square feet is required to provide at least twenty percent (20%) of the total residential floor area as reserved housing. For rental reserved housing, the requirement is fifteen percent (15%) of the floor area. In accordance with §15-218-18 of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules, the Applicant proposes to adjust density for reserved housing requirements and exclude residential floor area for reserved housing from calculations of floor area ratio (“FAR”). The Applicant proposes to construct 17,994 square feet of residential floor area to be designated as reserved housing.

Figure 1.3 of the Mauka Area Rules provides for a maximum density from 1.5 up to 3.5 for the CK neighborhood zone. Section 15-217-57(c) of the Mauka Area Rules provides that a maximum FAR of 1.5 shall be applicable in the CK neighborhood zone until the HCDA Executive Director determines the infrastructure is sufficiently adequate and then the FAR shall be increased to 3.5, consistent with the Mauka Area Rules.

Section 15-217-57(d) of the Mauka Area Rules provides that where the HCDA Executive Director finds that the public infrastructure is adequate to support a project within the CK neighborhood zone, or where a project would construct improvements to infrastructure to be sufficient to accommodate the subject project and future developments, the HCDA Executive Director may elect to waive the FAR limitations.
Comments received from the BWS indicate that the existing water system in the area is adequate to support the proposed development. However, the final decision on the availability of water will be confirmed when the building permit application for the development is submitted for approval.

City DES provided comments indicating that the DPP Wastewater Branch has lead role in issuing sewer connection permits for the Project. The Applicant has submitted a sewer connection permit for the project that has been approved by the DPP, Wastewater Branch.

Based on the information provided by various State and County agencies and submitted by the Applicant, staff finds that the public infrastructure in the area is adequate to support the development of the Project. Staff also finds that pursuant to §15-217-57(d), there is adequate information regarding public infrastructure in the area to support that the HCDA Executive Director waive the FAR limitation. Therefore, the HCDA Executive Director finds that there is adequate infrastructure in the area to support a density of 3.5 requested by the Applicant. The Applicant’s use of base FAR of 3.5 for the Project is consistent with the provision of §15-217-57 of the Mauka Area Rules.

Staff notes the creative solutions for proposed on-site parking with mechanical systems and sustainable design strategies that have a positive effect of maximizing efficiency and minimizing impact.

The Mauka Area Plan recognizes the predominant character of existing buildings in the CK area as light industrial and service businesses on primarily small lots. The residential use and mid-rise size of the proposed Project is appropriate within the surrounding context as the site uniquely borders the Kapiolani corridor and other adjacent residential projects that have a much higher use and density. In this regard, the proposed Project achieves the outcome of transitioning between neighborhood borders of varying development intensities.

Staff recognizes the Project’s inherent locational advantage of being within walking distance from both future Civic Center and Kakaako rail transit stations as well as the City and County’s bus transit hub at Alapai Street. The Project supports the Mauka Area Plan goals that aim to direct housing development along transportation corridors in order to achieve urban infill instead of urban sprawl and to reduce regional transportation impacts and costs.

Staff finds that the proposed land use and density is consistent with the requirements for land use, density, and adequacy of infrastructure as established in the Mauka Area Plan and Rules.
Building Type

The Project proposes an “Urban Block” as a building type that is permitted for the CK neighborhood zone according to Figure 1.3 of the Mauka Area Rules. The Project is consistent with all the requirements of Figure BT.8 of the Mauka Area Rules which specifies pedestrian access, parking design and location, open space, landscaping, frontage, and building massing.

Pedestrian access is provided directly to ground floor spaces from stoop frontage, and to upper floor spaces through an interior street level lobby along Waimanu Street and stairs along Kawaiahao Street.

Parking is proposed to be located on the street level only, and in the allowed parking zone in accordance with Figure 1.10-B of the Mauka Area Rules. Parking is proposed to be accessible by driveway entrances on both Waimanu Street and Kawaiahao Street with curb cuts located to the maximum extent possible away from adjacent property lines, in accordance with §15-217-63 of the Mauka Area Rules.

Open space is proposed to be at least fifteen percent (15%) of the lot area and to be provided on the second and fifth floors. Landscaping is not required for front or side yards. The proposed frontage type is Stoop, which is consistent with both the proposed building type and CK neighborhood zone.

Staff notes that the Project’s proposed building typology of urban block supports the vision for variation in building skyline and profile and is appropriate for the development site. Staff notes that the proposed Project balances a maximum use of floor plates that also offer architectural relief of setbacks, openings, and open spaces. The proposed Project prioritizes active street-fronts by designing residential stoops directly facing the street right-of-way, which also serves to conceal parking and loading. Staff notes that the Project proposes a site layout that offers both pedestrian accessibility and security.

Staff finds that the Project is consistent with the requirements for building typology established in the Mauka Area Rules.

Building Form and Height

The Project proposes a building form for an Urban Block that is consistent with the requirements of §15-217-54, Figure BT.8, and Figure 1.3-D of the Mauka Area Rules. The proposed 65-foot high structure is consistent with the maximum allowable 65-foot height for Block 24 of the CK neighborhood zone in accordance with Figures 1.8 and NZ.5 of the Mauka Area Rules. The Project site lies outside of view corridors and view preservation zones as provided in Figure 1.6B of the Mauka Area Rules. The Project proposes to provide a structure with a streetfront element as
required by §15-217-54(f) and Figure 1.12-A to be between twenty (20) to sixty-five (65) feet high.

The Project proposes a 20,229 square foot second floor and is consistent with the maximum floor plate ratios where the ratio of the fifth through seventh floors average sixty percent (60%) of the second floor, in accordance with Table BT.8-1 of the Mauka Area Rules.

The Project proposes a setback of floorplates starting on the fifth floor to create building voids along the street facing facades which is consistent with §15-217-54(c) of the Mauka Area Rules.

The Project proposes a ground floor height of sixteen (16) feet, which is higher than the minimum requirement of twelve (12) feet in accordance with §15-217-54(e) of the Mauka Area Rules.

Staff notes that the proposed building height of sixty-five (65) feet promotes the goal outlined in the Mauka Area Plan for Streetfront Elements to define the street as a public space and for development projects to transition to pedestrian-scaled activities on the street level. The stepped, upper-level floors provide relief from an imposing, uninterrupted street frontage.

Staff finds that the Project is consistent with the building form and height provisions of the Mauka Area Rules.

**Building Placement**

The Project is consistent with the requirements for build-to-line in accordance with §15-217-53, Figures NZ.5 and NZ.5-1 of the Mauka Area Rules, which in the CK neighborhood zone does not specify build-to-lines at Waimanu and Kawaiahao Streets and rear setbacks. The Project proposes that the residential block be built to the property line at Waimanu frontage and along the side boundaries on the west and the east, and setback from Kawaiahao Street by nine (9) feet.

Staff notes that the Project proposes an optimal building placement and attempts to mitigate issues related to close proximity to adjacent development. The Project proposes minimal openings from residential units to face the adjacent development. The upper floors increasingly step back away from the adjacent development to provide greater exposure to natural ventilation and daylight.

Staff finds that the Project is consistent with the building placement provisions of the Mauka Area Rules.
Frontage Type and Thoroughfare Plan

The Project is consistent with frontage and thoroughfare requirements of §15-217-25, 15-217-39, Figure 1.3 and Figure NZ.5B of the Mauka Area Rules. The Project is also consistent with the provisions of Figure PZ.5 of the Mauka Area Rules.

The Project proposes to utilize a “Stoop Frontage” on Kawaiahao Street and Waimanu Street which is consistent with Figure FT.2 of the Mauka Area Rules. The Project proposes a finished floor of the stoop which is consistent with the requirements for a maximum of three (3) feet from the final grade surface.

The Project is consistent with the provisions of §15-217-39 of the Mauka Area Rules and provides for the pedestrian zone, street trees and landscaping, street lighting and planting strips. Every thoroughfare shall have street trees planted within the public frontage area, with the exception of service streets, alleys and street right-of-way measuring forty (40) feet or less. Provisions for building placement and frontage is outlined in Figures 1.3 and NZ.5 of the Mauka Area Rules and does not specify a build-to-line at Kawaiahao and Waimanu frontages. The Project frontages on Kawaiahao and Waimanu Streets conforms with a minimum of seventy-five percent (75%) frontage occupancy.

Staff notes the proposed Project directly engages with two streetfronts and uniquely makes a connection with the street through designed stoop fronts for ground floor facing units.

Staff finds that the Project is consistent with the frontage type and thoroughfare plan provisions of the Mauka Area Rules.

Pedestrian Zone Treatment

The pedestrian zone is distinguished and organized according to three functional categories: pedestrian throughway area, furnishing area and private frontage area pursuant to §15-217-39(d) of the Mauka Area Rules. Figures 1.14 and PZ.5 of the Mauka Area Rules provide detailed requirements for pedestrian zone width standards.

The Project proposes to retain existing improvements, except for relocation of driveway curb cuts, and frontage improvements to match those fronting the adjoining property to the west.

Staff notes that the Project proposes to comply with the requirements for Pedestrian Zone Treatments, and that any furnishings located in the pedestrian zone, but still within the public right-of-way, will require confirmation by the appropriate City agency.
Architectural Design

Staff finds the Project to be consistent with §15-217-55 of the Mauka Area Rules, where applicable.

Open Space

The Project is consistent with the open space requirements for an Urban Block building as provided in Figure BT.8 of the Mauka Area Rules. The open space requirement for the Project is fifteen percent (15%) of the lot area and shall be a minimum dimension of forty (40) feet on any one side. The lot area of the proposed Project is 21,192 square feet; therefore, the required open space is 3,179 square feet (21,192 x 15% = 3,179). The Project is providing approximately 8,477 square feet of open space on the second and fifth floors, exceeding the open space requirement. The open space provided has a minimum dimension of forty (40) feet.

Staff finds that the Project is consistent with the open space provisions of the Mauka Area Rules.

Landscape and Recreation Space

The Project is consistent with the landscape and recreation space requirements of §15-217-56 and Figure 1.7 of the Mauka Area Rules. Section 15-217-56(d) of the Mauka Area Rules provides that, "Residential projects requiring a development permit shall provide fifty-five square feet of recreation space per dwelling unit. The required on-site recreation space, if provided outdoors, may be used to satisfy the open space requirement." The Project proposes a total of 153 residential units, therefore, requiring 8,415 square feet of on-site recreation space. The Project will provide 8,477 square feet of recreation space on the second and fifth floors, which exceeds requirements for open space and recreation space. The Project proposes exterior landscaped recreation space that also serves as open space on the second and fifth floors as provided by §15-217-56(d) of the Mauka Area Rules. The Project proposes to plant two tulipwood trees on Kawaiahao Street within the designated furnishing zone according to §15-217-56, Figures PZ.5 and 1.7 of the Mauka Area Rules. The Project is consistent with §15-217-56(c) of the Mauka Area Rules, which requires an automatic irrigation system with rain sensor controls.

Staff finds that the Project is consistent with the landscape and recreation space provisions of the Mauka Area Rules.

Green Building

The Project proposes to be consistent with green building requirements of §15-217-59 of the Mauka Area Rules and meet standards which result in a responsible
development pattern that conserves natural resources and provides a healthy environment for inhabitants of the Mauka Area. The Applicant has submitted documentation demonstrating intent to meet base Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design ("LEED") certified rating and conform to the Green Building standards requirement which was provided to the Authority at its public hearing on November 6, 2013. The Project proposes to achieve and document 40 credits according to the LEED 2009 New Construction checklist. The Project proposes to qualify for the Certified LEED rating. The Project is not required to certify or submit the Project to the U.S. Green Building Council ("USGBC") for Project recognition or approval. The Project proposes to achieve and document at least one (1) point in Sustainable Sites - Stormwater Design (Quality Control or Quantity Control), at least one (1) point in Sustainable Sites - Heat Island Effect (Non-roof or Roof) and at least one (1) point in Water Efficiency - Water Efficient Landscaping. The Project proposes photovoltaic panels on the roof of the top (seventh) floor.

Staff notes the Applicant’s commitment for a Project that is of a measurably high-standard for sustainable, and high-performance design. Staff notes that some of the unique “green” features proposed include a rooftop photovoltaic array, a rainwater catchment system for on-site storm water management, and a recycling program for the Project.

Staff finds that the Project is consistent with the green building provisions of the Mauka Area Rules.

**Flood Zone**

Section 15-217-61 of the Mauka Area Rules provides standards that apply to all new buildings within an identified Honolulu or Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") flood zone and that are required by code to have raised ground floors. The Project is within the Zone X of FEMA’s National Flood Insurance Program Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) which is an area determined to be outside the 0.2 percent annual chance of a 500-year flood. Based on this information, the provisions of §15-217-61 of the Mauka Area Rules are not applicable.

**Parking and Loading**

Section 15-217-63 of the Mauka Area Rules prioritizes parking access for a new building on a property that exceeds twenty-five percent (25%) of the existing floor area on a property. Access to parking shall be from an alley, and where there is no alley present then parking shall be accessed from a parking access street as indicated in Figure 1.10-B of the Mauka Area Rules. Driveway access for parking shall be a minimum of fifty-five (55) feet from an intersection measured from the right-of-way, and curb cuts shall be setback a minimum of twenty-two (22) feet from adjacent properties.
The Project proposes to locate vehicular access on Waimanu Street and Kawaiahao Street in conformance with the required dimensions from adjacent property lines. The Project proposes that the Mauka entry from Waimanu Street and the Makai entry from Kawaiahao Street would be one-way vehicle entry. The width and placement of the proposed curb cuts is consistent with the required maximum twelve (12) feet width and setback a minimum of twenty-two (22) feet from adjacent property lines as provided in §15-217-63(c) of the Mauka Area Rules.

Placement of parking is required to be screened from view of the public frontage by a liner building or by landscaping, green screens or cladding, and to be placed within the “Allowed Parking Zone” according Figure BT.8 and Figure 1.10-B of the Mauka Area Rules.

The Project proposes ground floor parking that will be concealed on the two public frontages (Waimanu and Kawaiahao Streets) by liner building of habitable space in conformance with Mauka Area Rules requirements.

In accordance with the provisions of §15-217-63(e)(2) of the Mauka Area Rules, there is no off-street parking requirements for the CK neighborhood zone. However, in accordance with the provisions of §15-218-18(a)(3) of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules, off-street parking requirement for reserved housing unit is one (1) parking stall per unit. Consequently, parking is required only for reserved housing units in CK. The Project proposes 153 residential units, of which twenty-four (24) are for required reserved housing units. A total of ninety-two (92) off-street parking stalls are provided in the Project out of which twenty-four (24) stalls are assigned for reserved housing units.

Section 15-217-63(m) of the Mauka Area Rules requires both short-term and long-term bicycle parking be provided, and that bicycle parking shall be provided within forty (40) feet of principle entry. The Project proposes bicycle parking on the ground floor immediately adjacent to the lobby entrance.

The Mauka Area Rules require that loading spaces shall be provided for residential uses. Loading requirements are associated with uses and floor area. The Project proposes 89,006 square feet of residential floor area. Pursuant to §15-217-63(l), Loading of the Mauka Area Rules one (1) loading stall shall be provided for floor areas of 20,000 to 150,000 multiple-family dwellings. The Project proposes the required one (1) loading stall, with minimum horizontal dimensions of 12 feet x 35 feet and a vertical clearance of at least fourteen (14) feet.

The Project proposes to conform with minimum aisle dimensions of twenty-two (22) feet for parking at ninety (90) degrees in accordance with §15-217-63(h)(3) of the Mauka Area Rules.
The Project proposes a mechanical parking system which is consistent with §15-217-63(4) of the Mauka Area Rules and is visually screened from view by a residential liner on the ground floor streetfronts, in accordance with provisions of §15-217-63(5) of the Mauka Area Rules.

Staff finds that the Project is consistent with the off-street parking and loading provisions of the Mauka Area Rules.

**Public Facilities Dedication**

The Project proposes 89,006 square feet of residential space. As provided by §15-217-65 of the Mauka Area Rules, 17,994 square feet of floor area for reserved housing is exempt from public facilities dedication requirement. Therefore, 71,012 square feet of residential floor area is subject to public facilities dedication fee. Section 15-217-65(d)(2) of the Mauka Area Rules provides for a public facilities dedication of four percent (4%) of the total residential floor area. The total public facilities dedication requirement for the Project is 2,840 square feet of land. The Applicant is proposing to dedicate 866 square feet of land along Kawaiahao Street as public facilities dedication. The Applicant is requesting payment of a cash-in-lieu fee for the remaining 1,974 square feet of remaining public facilities dedication fee. Section 15-217-65(c)(2) of the Mauka Area Rules provides that the Authority may authorize a developer to pay a fee equal to the value of land which would otherwise have had to be dedicated.

Section 15-217-65(f) of the Mauka Area Rules provides for the process of valuation of land when a public facilities dedication cash-in-lieu fee is to be paid. A recent (May 29, 2013) appraisal conducted for a land parcel located in the KCDD identified as 690 Pohukaina Street indicates a land value of $189 per square feet. Staff believes that the appraised land value for 690 Pohukaina Street parcel is indicative of prevailing land value in the KCDD and recommends the same land value for the proposed Project. Based on a recent land value of $189 per square feet, the proposed cash-in-lieu public facilities dedication fee for the Project will be $373,086.00.

Staff recommends that the Authority approve the Applicant’s proposal for meeting the public facilities dedication requirement by a combination of dedicating approximately 866 square feet of land along Kawaiahao Street and paying a cash-in-lieu fee of $373,086.00. The Applicant shall prepare all necessary land dedication documents and dedicated the land to the HCDA prior to HCDA approval of the initial certificate of occupancy for the Project.

**Reserved Housing**

Section 15-218-17 of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules provides that any development containing multi-family dwelling units on a development lot of at least
20,000 square feet shall provide at least twenty percent (20%) of the total residential floor area in the development for sale to qualified persons as determined by the Authority.

The Project consists of 89,006 square feet of residential floor area. The Applicant is proposing to designate 17,994 square feet of residential floor area as reserved housing in the Project, which amounts to 20.1% of the floor area and translates to twenty-four (24) units. Of the units designated as reserved housing six (6) units are studios, seventeen (17) units are one-bedroom, and one (1) unit is two-bedroom.

The Applicant is requesting the option for providing reserved housing as for sale or rental housing. Though the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules require only fifteen percent (15%) of floor area for rental reserved housing, the Applicant is proposing to provide twenty percent (20%) of the floor area as reserved housing in the event that the Applicant selects to provide reserved housing units as rental reserved housing units.

The Applicant is also requesting the option to designate additional reserved housing units in the Project than what is required for the Project and obtain credits for these additional reserved housing units that can be utilized to satisfy reserved housing requirement for other residential projects within the KCDD.

Due to the off-street parking requirement for reserved housing units, only sixty-seven (67) units in the Project will be eligible for consideration as additional reserved housing units. Since the residential units in the Project are predominantly studio units, staff believes that any credit for the units needs to reflect the fact that actual units that are associated with the credits are studio units. Therefore, a multiplier of less than one (1) will have to be utilized to convert reserved housing units into reserved housing credits. Typically, reserved housing units reflect the mix of unit types in a particular project with some combination of studio, one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and three-bedroom units. In considering credits for additional reserved housing for this Project, it is not possible at this time to predict the unit mix of a future project for which these reserved housing credits will be utilized. Therefore, it is reasonable to assign a scaled value for a studio unit such that if the studio unit credit is utilized to meet a studio reserved housing unit in a future project the credit value will be one hundred percent (one studio unit per one studio unit). If a studio credit is utilized to meet a one-bedroom reserved housing unit in a future project, the credit value will be seventy-five percent (0.75 one bedroom unit/studio unit), if a studio credit is utilized to meet a two-bedroom reserved housing in a future project, the credit value will be sixty-six percent (0.66 two-bedroom unit/studio unit), if a studio credit is utilized to meet a three-bedroom reserved housing unit in a future project, the credit value will be fifty percent (0.50 three-bedroom unit/studio unit).
The weighted average of the scaled credit value that may be applied towards future one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and three-bedroom units is sixty-three percent (63%). Based on this analysis, staff believes that providing sixty-three percent (63%) credit for any additional reserved housing would be considered reasonable. For example, using this formula, the Applicant could receive sixty-three (63) units reserved housing credit for providing 100 studio units in the Project as additional reserved housing units, and the credit could be used on a one-to-one basis towards a future residential development regardless of the unit mix.

For the remaining sixty-two (62) residential units that do not have an assigned off-street parking stall, the Applicant is exploring the possibility of providing parking outside of the Project. Section 15-217-63(f)(3) of the Mauka Area Rules provides for locating the required parking for a project within 1,200 feet of the Project location. The Applicant is requesting the option of designating the sixty-two (62) units as reserved housing units if the Applicant is successful in securing parking for the units consistent with §15-217-63(f)(3) of the Mauka Area Rules. Such additional parking secured by the Applicant will be subject to the provisions of §15-217-63(f)(3) of the Mauka Area Rules during the regulated term of the reserved housing.

Staff finds that the Applicant’s request to provide surplus residential units that would meet and qualify as additional reserved housing for reserved housing credits is not ripe for review by the Authority and should be considered at a later time upon submittal of a reserved housing credit program by the Applicant for consideration by the Authority.

**Displacement of Existing Uses**

The present single-story industrial buildings on the property are occupied by six (6) tenants, all associated with some form of automotive repair. Four of the tenants are on a month-to-month basis; the other two (2) have leases that expired in September and October of 2013. All businesses will vacate the property well before Project construction begins.

**VIII. PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

There was five (5) public testimonies in support of the Project, 108 testimonies in opposition, and two (2) comments of the Project received at the time of the first public hearing on November 6, 2013. At the time of submitting this report, HCDA staff has received an additional eight (8) public testimonies in support of the Project, 118 public testimonies in opposition of the Project, and one (1) comment of the Project. The Court Reporter’s transcripts from November 6, 2013 public hearing and October 12, October 15, November 16, November 19, December 14, and December 17, 2013 Supplemental Comment Sessions, a staff summary of the hearing
as well as all public testimony received since the first hearing is provided hereto as Exhibit B.

IX. FINDINGS OF FACT RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION

Section 15-217-80(d) of the Mauka Area Rules requires the following Findings of Fact in approving a Development Permit application:

A. **Consistency with the Mauka Area Plan**: That the Project complies with and advances the goals, policies and objectives of the Mauka Area Plan;

B. **Consistency with the Mauka Area Rules**: That the Project proposal will protect, preserve, or enhance desirable neighborhood characteristics through compliance with the standards and guidelines of the Mauka Area Rules; and

C. **Compatibility of the Mauka district**: That the Project proposal will not have a substantial adverse effect on the surrounding land uses and will be compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area.

Regarding the Development Permit application, staff presents the following Findings of Fact:

Based on the analysis above on matters relating to land use, neighborhood zone and building type, Project density and joint development, FAR transfer, floor area purchase from the HCDA, building placement, building form, frontage type, thoroughfare plan, architectural design, landscape and recreation space, green building, flood zone, parking and loading, public facilities dedication fee, and reserved housing, staff finds that the Project as proposed is consistent with the objectives of the Mauka Area Plan and Rules. The Project complies with and advances the goals, policies and objectives of the Mauka Area Plan. The Project protects, preserves, and enhances desirable neighborhood characteristics through compliance with standards and guidelines of the Mauka Area Rules. The Project does not have adverse effect on the surrounding land uses and is compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area.

Regarding provisions of §15-217-57 of the Mauka Area Rules, based on the sewer connection application approved by DPP, Wastewater Branch, the comments provided by the BWS, and the fact that the Applicant is preparing a TIAR to address
any traffic concern, the HCDA Executive Director finds that the existing infrastructure in the area can support the proposed Project.

X. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that:

A. The Authority adopts the following Findings of Fact relating to the Development Permit application:

1. The Project as proposed is consistent with the objectives of the Mauka Area Plan and Rules.

2. The Project complies with and advances the goals, policies and objectives of the Mauka Area Plan.

3. The Project protects, preserves, and enhances desirable neighborhood characteristics through compliance with standards and guidelines of the Mauka Area Rules.

4. The Project does not have adverse effect on the surrounding land uses and is compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area.

5. As determined by the Executive Director, there is adequate infrastructure capacity in the area to support the Project.

B. The Authority approves the 803 Waimanu Street Development Permit No. KAK 13-091 as presented by HCDA staff.

Attachments: Exhibit A – Traffic Impact Assessment Report
Exhibit B – Additional Public Testimonies, Staff’s Summary of the November 6, 2013 Public Hearing, and Court Reporter’s Transcripts from November 6, 2013 Public Hearing and Supplemental Comment Sessions November 16, November 19, December 14, and December 17, 2013
Exhibit C – Proposed Development Permit for KAK 13-091
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Exhibit A
Introduction

MJF Development Corporation has proposed to develop a 7-story mid-rise condominium called 803 Waimanu within the mauka portion of Kakaako. The project is located makai of Waimanu Street at its intersection with Dreier Street near Kapiolani Boulevard. Imperial Plaza is located at the Ewa end of Waimanu, just past Dreier Street and adjacent to the project. 803 Waimanu will replace the existing roughly 20k square foot (SF) auto body shop currently operating out of the lot. The vicinity map is shown in Figure 1.

803 Waimanu will be constructed in a single phase which will consist of 153 residential dwelling units and 91 parking stalls. The project site plan in Figure 2 shows that 803 Waimanu will be accessed from Waimanu Street via a one-way in driveway. Exiting traffic will use a one-way out driveway to Kawaiahao Street.
Figure 2  Site Plan
**Existing Conditions**

The proposed development is located between Waimanu Street and Kawaiahao Street near Dreier Street. The site is currently occupied by an auto body shop. Waimanu Street and Kawaiahao Street are both two lane roadways characterized by similar light industrial land uses.

Imperial Plaza is located directly Ewa on the adjacent lot. Imperial Plaza is a mixed-use development consisting of 261 residential dwelling units with 4 floors of retail commercial and office space.

**Data Collection**

Existing traffic conditions were observed and documented. Field observations of intersection operations and general intersection characteristics were noted at study area intersections. Geometric lane configurations and intersection traffic control data were collected. Intersection geometry inventory included the following:

- Number of lanes and lane widths,
- Crosswalk locations,
- Unsignalized intersection control,
- Posted speed limits.

All study area intersections are unsignalized, stop-controlled intersections. At the intersection of Kapioalani Boulevard and Dreier Street, mauka-bound Dreier left turns are prohibited. The intersection of Waimanu Street and Dreier Street is all-way stop-controlled.

Intersection turning movement counts were conducted at the following intersections from Wednesday, November 6 to Thursday, November 7, 2013 during the AM and PM peak periods at the following intersections:

- Kapioalani Boulevard/Dreier Street
- Waimanu Street/Dreier Street
- Kawaiahao Street/Cooke Street
- Kawaiahao Street/Imperial Plaza Driveway
The AM and PM peak hours were found to occur from 7:30 to 8:30 AM and from 4:15 to 5:15 PM, respectively. Figure 3 shows the existing peak hour traffic volumes for each turning movement at these intersections. These data were used as inputs into the intersection analyses. Appendix A contains the traffic count data.

The existing lane configurations within the study area are shown in Figure 4. During the AM peak period, a contra-flow lane is provided in the town-bound direction on Kapiolani Boulevard for a total of 4 downtown-bound lanes. No contra-flow is provided during the PM peak period. On Cooke Street, parking restrictions during the PM peak period enable both mauka-bound through lanes to be used. During the AM peak, on-street parking reduces the mauka-bound travel way to a single lane.

Parking

Metered on-street parking is provided along Cooke Street on the Diamond Head side. This parking is restricted between 3:30 PM and 5:30 PM, which effectively opens up an additional mauka-bound lane on Cooke Street. Metered parking is provided on Kawaiahao Street Ewa of Cooke Street. On the Diamond Head side of Cooke Street, no sidewalks are provided beyond the park across from Imperial Plaza and vehicles park on both sides of Kawaiahao Street. Unmarked and unsigned parking is also provided on Dreier Street and Waimanu Street within the project area.

Existing Operations

The study area intersections were analyzed using the methodologies for unsignalized intersections outlined in the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Operating conditions at an intersection by approach are expressed as a qualitative measure known as Level of Service (LOS) ranging from A to F. LOS A represents free-flow operations with low delay, while LOS F represents congested conditions with relatively high delay. Appendix B has more detailed definitions of intersection LOS. Appendix C contains the Synchro worksheets.

Field observations were performed at selected intersections to verify the results of the intersection analyses. Table 1 displays the existing condition LOS for each intersection.
Figure 3 Existing Traffic Volumes
Figure 4  Existing Lane Configurations
Table 1  Existing Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiolani Blvd/Dreier St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreier St mauka-bound right</td>
<td>B 11</td>
<td>B 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiolani Blvd Ewa-bound left</td>
<td>A 10</td>
<td>C 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke St/Kawaiahao St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke St mauka-bound left</td>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>A 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke St makai-bound left</td>
<td>A 8</td>
<td>A 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawaiahao St KKHD-bound left/through</td>
<td>C 22</td>
<td>D 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawaiahao St KKHD-bound right</td>
<td>B 10</td>
<td>A 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawaiahao St Ewa-bound left/through/right</td>
<td>C 18</td>
<td>C 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreier St/Waimanu St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreier St makai-bound left/right</td>
<td>A 7</td>
<td>A 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimanu St KKHD-bound left/through</td>
<td>A 7</td>
<td>A 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimanu St Ewa-bound through/right</td>
<td>A 7</td>
<td>A 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delay expressed in seconds per vehicle.

Signal Warrant Analysis

Peak hour traffic signal warrant analysis was performed for the existing AM and PM peak hours at the intersection of Cooke Street and Kawaiahao Street. Using the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) 2009 Edition traffic signal warrant methodology, it was determined that the intersection does not satisfy the peak hour signal warrant during either peak hour. Warrant analysis is included in Appendix D.

Summary of Results

Overall the study area intersections operate acceptably in the existing condition. Two issues were identified under the existing conditions:

- Kapiolani Boulevard/Dreier Street – During the AM peak hour, the left-most Ewa-bound Kapiolani Boulevard lane would queue back from Cooke Street. As this lane serves as a de facto left turn lane at Cooke Street, the queuing was likely due to the downstream intersection. During the PM peak hour, town-bound congestion on Kapiolani Boulevard would prevent vehicles attempting to make the left turn to...
Dreier Street from reaching the intersection to make the turn. During both peak hours, left turning vehicles were observed to have adequate gaps to complete the left turn despite the queuing.

- Cooke Street/Kawaiahao Street - During the PM peak period, queues originating from the mauka-bound Cooke Street approach at Kapiolani Boulevard were observed. These queues would go as far back as Kawaiahao Street and persisted beyond 5:30 PM, when on-street parking on Cooke Street was permitted. This in turn prevented vehicles from accessing Cooke Street from Kawaiahao Street. Vehicles at the Ewa-bound Kawaiahao Street approach were also hindered by on-street parking, which reduces the approach to a single approach lane.
**Projected 2015 Conditions**

803 Waimanu is projected to be completed in the Year 2015, which was used as the horizon year for future traffic analysis.

**2015 Without Project**

Historical data along Kapiolani Boulevard and Cooke Street shows negligible or negative growth. Therefore, the Kakaako Mauka Area Plan Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Transportation Analysis report dated April 14, 2009 was consulted and a 1.15% annual growth rate was obtained. Projected 2015 background volumes were calculated by applying this growth rate to existing 2013 traffic volumes.

Figure 5 shows the projected 2015 peak hour turning movement volumes without project for each turning movement at the study area intersections.

**2015 With Project**

The With-Project scenario adds projected trips generated by the project to the Without-Project scenario. The assumed roadway networks are the same. 803 Waimanu consists of 153 dwelling units (DU) of residential condo/townhouse. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation, 9th Edition was used to estimate the number of trips generated by the project.

Table 2 summarizes the trips generated by the proposed 803 Waimanu development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 Trip Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITE Code</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Condo/Townhouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trip Generation expressed in vehicles per hour
Figure 5  Projected 2015 Turning Movement Volumes Without Project
The traffic generated by the project was directionally distributed and assigned to the future roadway network using existing traffic patterns. The project-generated trip assignment was then added to the projected background traffic to obtain the total peak hour turning movement volumes shown in Figure 6.

Projected 2015 Operations

LOS analysis was performed for the study area intersections for the With and Without Project scenarios. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3. As shown, the project has a minimal impact on the study area intersection operations.

Table 3 Projected 2015 Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiolani Blvd/Dreier St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreier St mauka-bound right</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiolani Blvd Ewa-bound left</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke St/Kawaiahao St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke St mauka-bound left</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke St makai-bound left</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawaiahao St KKHD-bound left/through</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawaiahao St KKHD-bound right</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawaiahao St Ewa-bound left/through/right</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreier St/Waimanu St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreier St makai-bound left/right</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimanu St KKHD-bound left/through</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimanu St Ewa-bound through/right</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delay expressed in seconds per vehicle.
Figure 6  Projected 2015 Turning Movement Volumes With Project
**Signal Warrant Analysis**

Peak Hour traffic signal warrant analysis was performed using projected 2015 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes with and without project at the intersection of Cooke Street and Kawaiahao Street. Using the MUTCD traffic signal warrant methodology, it was determined that the intersection does not satisfy the peak hour signal warrant with or without the project. Warrant analysis is included in Appendix D.

**Summary of Results**

As shown in Table 3, the project does not significantly impact the operations at the study area intersections. Based on the analysis results and field observations, the following are recommended:

- Construct project access driveways on Waimanu Street and Kawaiahao Street:
  - One-way in driveway on Waimanu Street.
  - One-way out driveway on Kawaiahao Street. This driveway should be configured as a share left/right turn lane with stop control.

- Based on American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) sight distance guidelines, restrict parking on the mauka side of Kawaiahao Street fronting the property for 115’ in each direction of the project driveway. This restriction would cover the area between the Imperial Plaza driveway and the Diamond Head property line of 803 Waimanu. Approximately 4 parking stalls would be displaced.

- Provide sidewalks on Waimanu Street and Kawaiahao Street for the areas fronting the project.

- It is not recommended to install a traffic signal at the intersection of Cooke Street and Kawaiahao Street. The existing two-way stop control should be preserved.
APPENDICES
**Intersection:** Cooke St and Kawaiahao St

**Date:** 11/6/2013

**By:** Phil Matsunaga

**Weather:** Clear

---

**AM COUNT SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Total Mvmt</th>
<th>Total Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30 AM - 6:45 AM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 AM - 7:00 AM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM - 7:15 AM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15 AM - 7:30 AM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM - 7:45 AM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 AM - 8:00 AM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM - 8:15 AM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 AM - 8:30 AM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phf</td>
<td><strong>0.900</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.938</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.583</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.958</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.904</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.591</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.779</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.917</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.682</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.636</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.826</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.917</strong></td>
<td>Peak Phf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM - 8:30 AM</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>0.945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Hour**

**North:**

- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM
- 203 RIGHT
- 300 THRU
- 26 LEFT
- 302

**South:**

- 366 RIGHT
- 142 THRU
- 28 LEFT
- 69

**Street:** Cooke St

---

**Street:** Kawaiahao St

---

PARSONS
BRINCKERHOFF
PM COUNT SHEET

Intersection: Cooke St and Kawaiahao St
Date: 11/6/2013
By: Phil Matsunaga
Weather: Clear

Street: Kawaiahao St

Street: Cooke St

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM - 4:15 PM</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM - 4:30 PM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM - 4:45 PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM - 5:15 PM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM - 5:30 PM</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 PM - 5:45 PM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 PM - 6:00 PM</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phf 0.731 0.833 0.514 0.818 0.719 0.869 0.833 0.679 0.938 0.887 0.875

Peak Phf 4:15 PM - 5:15 PM 38 20 37 72 313 23 73 30 38 60 440 28 1172 0.948

Peak Hour

4:15 PM - 5:15 PM

North

550

Street: Kawaiahao St

South

528

Street: Cooke St

PARSONS BRINCKERHOF
Intersection: Kawaiahao St and Driveway  
Date: 11/6/2013  
By: Phil Matsunaga  
Weather: Clear  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Total Mvmt</th>
<th>Total Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30 AM - 6:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 AM - 7:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM - 7:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15 AM - 7:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM - 7:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 AM - 8:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM - 8:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 AM - 8:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM - 8:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Hour**

- **North**
  - 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM
  - Right: 41
  - Thru: 0
  - Left: 22
  - Phf: 0.905

- **South**
  - 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM
  - Right: 0
  - Thru: 0
  - Left: 0

**Street:** Kawaiahao Street

**Street:** Driveway

PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF
# PM COUNT SHEET

**Intersection:** Kawaiahao St and Driveway

**Date:** 11/6/2013

**By:** Phil Matsunaga

**Weather:** Rainy

**Street:** Kawaiahao Street

**South Street:** Driveway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Total Mvmt</th>
<th>Total Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM - 4:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM - 4:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM - 4:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM - 5:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM - 5:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 PM - 5:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 PM - 6:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Phf**

4:15 PM - 5:15 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak Phf</th>
<th>0.842</th>
<th>0.886</th>
<th>0.841</th>
<th>0.417</th>
<th>0.542</th>
<th>0.728</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>Peak Phf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Hour**

4:15 PM - 5:15 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Street: Kawaiahao Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM - 5:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Street: Driveway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Street:** Driveway
**AM COUNT SHEET**

**Intersection:** Kapiolani Blvd and Drier St  
**Date:** 11/7/2013  
**By:** David Miyasaki  
**Weather:** Cloudy

---

### TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30 AM - 6:45 AM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 AM - 7:00 AM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM - 7:15 AM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15 AM - 7:30 AM</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM - 7:45 AM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 AM - 8:00 AM</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM - 8:15 AM</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 AM - 8:30 AM</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM - 8:30 AM</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Hour**

**North**

- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: 1482

- Total Mvmt: 2218  
- Total Hour: 0.968

**South**

- Total Mvmt: 8

---

**Phf**

- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: 0.910
- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: #DIV/0!
- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: #DIV/0!
- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: #DIV/0!
- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: 0.858
- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: 0.847
- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: 0.694
- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: 0.625
- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: #DIV/0!
- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: 0.250

**Peak Phf**

- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: 0.847

---

**Street: Kapiolani Boulevard**

**Street: Drier Street**

---

**PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF**
**PM COUNT SHEET**

Intersection: Kapiolani Blvd and Drier St  
Date: 11/7/2013  
By: David Miyasaki  
Weather: Cloudy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Total Mvmt</th>
<th>Total Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM - 4:15 PM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>2256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM - 4:30 PM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>2313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM - 4:45 PM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>2289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM - 5:15 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>2216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM - 5:30 PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 PM - 5:45 PM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 PM - 6:00 PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Phf | 0.788 | 0.976 | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 0.945 | 0.793 | 0.821 | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 0.250 | Peak Phf | 2313 | 0.957 |

**Peak Hour**

**North**

4:15 PM - 5:15 PM  
RIGHT 1169

**South**

4:15 PM - 5:15 PM  
LEFT 133

---

PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF
**AM COUNT SHEET**

**Intersection:** Waimanu St and Drier St  
**Date:** 11/7/2013  
**By:** Phil Matsunaga  
**Weather:** Cloudy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Total Mvmt</th>
<th>Total Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30 AM - 6:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 AM - 7:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM - 7:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15 AM - 7:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM - 7:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 AM - 8:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM - 8:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 AM - 8:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phf</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>0.250</th>
<th>0.550</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>0.578</th>
<th>0.550</th>
<th>0.429</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>Peak Phf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Hour**

**North Street:** Waimanu Street  
**South Street:** Drier Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Total Mvmt</th>
<th>Total Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM - 8:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Hour**

- **North Street:** Waimanu Street  
  - 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: 34
- **South Street:** Drier Street  
  - 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM: 0

**Phf:** #DIV/0! #DIV/0! 0.250 0.550 #DIV/0! 0.578 0.550 0.429 #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! Peak Phf

**PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF**
Intersection: Waimanu St and Drier St
Date: 11/7/2013
By: Phil Matsunaga
Weather: Rainy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Total Mvmt</th>
<th>Total Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM - 4:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM - 4:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM - 4:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM - 5:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM - 5:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 PM - 5:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 PM - 6:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phf</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>0.375</th>
<th>0.250</th>
<th>0.679</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>0.875</th>
<th>0.795</th>
<th>0.500</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>#DIV/0!</th>
<th>Peak phf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM - 5:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Hour

Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM - 5:15 PM</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street: Waimanu Street

Street: Drier Street
APPENDIX B  LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS

The Highway Capacity Manual defines six Intersection Levels of Service (LOS), labeled A through F, from free flow to congested conditions.

For unsignalized intersections, the Highway Capacity Manual evaluates gaps in the major street traffic flow and calculates available gaps for left-turns across oncoming traffic and for the left and right-turns onto the major roadway from the minor street. Average control delay, based on these factors, is still used to define the levels of service.

**LEVEL-OF-SERVICE A:** Low control delay, up to 10 s/veh.

**LEVEL-OF-SERVICE B:** Control delay greater than 10 and up to 15 s/veh.

**LEVEL-OF-SERVICE C:** Control delay greater than 15 and up to 25 s/veh.

**LEVEL-OF-SERVICE D:** Control delay greater than 25 and up to 35 s/veh.

**LEVEL-OF-SERVICE E:** Control delay greater than 35 and up to 50 s/veh.

**LEVEL-OF-SERVICE F:** Control delay in excess of 50 s/veh.
APPENDIX C  INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS WORKSHEETS
### Intersection Delay, s/veh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vol, veh/h</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign Control</strong></td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RT Channelized</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storage Length</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veh in Median Storage, #</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade, %</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak Hour Factor</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heavy Vehicles, %</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mvmt Flow</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major/Minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Minor</th>
<th>Minor2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflicting Flow All</strong></td>
<td>835</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>342</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-up Headway</strong></td>
<td>3.519</td>
<td>4.019</td>
<td>3.319</td>
<td>3.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</strong></td>
<td>273</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>527</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>672</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time blocked-Platoon, %</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver</strong></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>492</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Lane / Major Mvmt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Lane / Major Mvmt</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>EBLn1</th>
<th>EBLn2</th>
<th>WBLn1</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity (veh/h)</strong></td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</strong></td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HCM Control Delay (s)</strong></td>
<td>8.757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>7.644</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HCM Lane LOS</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</strong></td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection
Intersection Delay, s/veh 0.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade, %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Minor</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Flow All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Headway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time blocked-Platoon, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Lane / Major Mvmt</th>
<th>NBLn1</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.501</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Volume Exceeds Capacity; $: Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error: Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

**Intersection Delay, s/veh** 7.1  
**Intersection LOS** A

<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>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approach

**Opposing Approach** WB  
**Opposing Lanes** 1   0

**Conflicting Approach Left** SB  
**Conflicting Lanes Left** 1   1

**Conflicting Approach Right**  
**Conflicting Lanes Right** 0   1

**HCM Control Delay** 7.3 6.9 7.2

**HCM LOS** A A A

### Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane</th>
<th>EBLn1</th>
<th>WBLn1</th>
<th>SBLn1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol Left, %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol Thru, %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol Right, %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Vol by Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT Vol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Vol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Vol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Flow Rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry Grp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Util (X)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure Headway (Hd)</td>
<td>4.266</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence, Y/N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Time</td>
<td>2.293</td>
<td>1.784</td>
<td>1.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th-tile Q</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**  
~: Volume Exceeds Capacity; $: Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error: Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

**Intersection Delay, s/veh**: 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movmt Flow</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Minor</th>
<th>Minor2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Flow All</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Headway</td>
<td>3.519</td>
<td>4.019</td>
<td>3.319</td>
<td>3.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Lane / Major Mvmt</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>EBLn1</th>
<th>EBLn2</th>
<th>WBLn1</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>8.757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>7.644</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

- : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

Intersection Delay, s/veh  0.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade, %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Minor</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Flow All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Headway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time blocked-Platoon, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Lane / Major Mvmt</th>
<th>NBLn1</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.501</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

Intersection Delay, s/veh | 7.1
---|---
Intersection LOS | A

### Movement

<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>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposing Approach</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposing Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Approach Left</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes Left</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Approach Right</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes Right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EBLn1</th>
<th>WBLn1</th>
<th>SBLn1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol Left, %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol Thru, %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol Right, %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Vol by Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT Vol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Vol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Vol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Flow Rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry Grp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Util (X)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure Headway (Hd)</td>
<td>4.266</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence, Y/N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Time</td>
<td>2.293</td>
<td>1.784</td>
<td>1.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th-tile Q</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

**Intersection Delay, s/veh**: 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Major/Minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Flow All</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Headway</td>
<td>3.519</td>
<td>4.019</td>
<td>3.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time blocked-Platoon, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minor Lane / Major Mvmt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>EBLn1</th>
<th>EBLn2</th>
<th>WBLn1</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>8.805</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>7.656</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>1.585</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

Intersection Delay, s/veh 0.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade, %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Minor</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Flow All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Headway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time blocked-Platoon, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Lane / Major Mvmt</th>
<th>NBLn1</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.587</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
- Volume Exceeds Capacity; $: Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error: Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Delay, s/veh</th>
<th>7.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol, veh/h</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposing Approach</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>EB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposing Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Approach Left</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes Left</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Approach Right</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes Right</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol Left, %</th>
<th>EBLn1</th>
<th>WBLn1</th>
<th>SBLn1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol Thru, %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol Right, %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Vol by Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT Vol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Vol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Vol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Flow Rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry Grp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Util (X)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure Headway (Hd)</td>
<td>4.268</td>
<td>3.762</td>
<td>3.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence, Y/N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Time</td>
<td>2.295</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>1.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th-tile Q</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

Intersection Delay, s/veh: 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Minor</th>
<th>Minor2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Flow All</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Headway</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time blocked-Platoon, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Lane / Major Mvmt</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>EBL1</th>
<th>EBL2</th>
<th>WBL1</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>8.283</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.655</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>2.416</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

Intersection Delay, s/veh 3.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade, %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Major/Minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflicting Flow All</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Headway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCM Control Delay, s</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Minor Lane / Major Mvmt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity (veh/h)</th>
<th>NBLn1</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.525</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Delay, s/veh</th>
<th>7.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Movement

<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>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposing Approach</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposing Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Approach Left</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes Left</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Approach Right</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes Right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane</th>
<th>EBLn1</th>
<th>WBLn1</th>
<th>SBLn1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol Left, %</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol Thru, %</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol Right, %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Vol by Lane</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT Vol</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Vol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Vol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Flow Rate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry Grp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Util (X)</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure Headway (Hd)</td>
<td>4.305</td>
<td>3.677</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence, Y/N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Time</td>
<td>2.384</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>2.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th-tile Q</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

**Intersection Delay, s/veh** 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Minor</th>
<th>Minor2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Flow All</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Headway</td>
<td>3.519</td>
<td>4.019</td>
<td>3.319</td>
<td>3.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time blocked-Platoon, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Lane / Major Mvmt</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>EBLn1</th>
<th>EBLn2</th>
<th>WBLn1</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>8.805</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>7.656</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>2.525</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
## Intersection

**Intersection Delay, s/veh** 0.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>- None</td>
<td>- None</td>
<td>- None</td>
<td>- None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade, %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major/Minor

#### Conflicting Flow All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Headway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time blocked-Platoon, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Lane / Major Mvmt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NBLn1</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.636</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Delay, s/veh</th>
<th>7.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>1 0 13 11 38 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>1 0 14 12 41 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
<td>0 1 1 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposing Approach</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposing Lanes</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Approach Left</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes Left</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Approach Right</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes Right</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay</td>
<td>7.3 6.9 7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>A A A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane</th>
<th>EBLn1</th>
<th>WBLn1</th>
<th>SBLn1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol Left, %</td>
<td>100% 0% 54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol Thru, %</td>
<td>0% 54% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol Right, %</td>
<td>0% 46% 46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Stop Stop Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Vol by Lane</td>
<td>1 24 71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT Vol</td>
<td>0 13 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Vol</td>
<td>0 11 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Vol</td>
<td>1 0 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Flow Rate</td>
<td>1 26 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry Grp</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Util (X)</td>
<td>0.001 0.028 0.082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure Headway (Hd)</td>
<td>4.29 3.796 3.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence, Y/N</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>833 943 944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Time</td>
<td>2.32 1.821 1.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.001 0.028 0.082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay</td>
<td>7.3 6.9 7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>A A A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th-tile Q</td>
<td>0 0.1 0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

**Intersection Delay, s/veh** 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds,#/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Minor</th>
<th>Minor2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Flow All</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Headway</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time blocked-Platoon, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Lane / Major Mvmt</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>EBLn1</th>
<th>EBLn2</th>
<th>WBLn1</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>8.283</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>8.655</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>3.028</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
- : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

Intersection Delay, s/veh | 4.1
---|---

### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade, %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major/Minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflicting Flow All</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Headway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time blocked-Platoon, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Lane / Major Mvmt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Lane / Major Mvmt</th>
<th>NBLn1</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.514</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
### Intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Delay, s/veh</th>
<th>7.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposing Approach</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>EB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposing Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Approach Left</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes Left</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Approach Right</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes Right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lane

| Vol Left, % | EBLn1 | 40% | 0% | 62% |
| Vol Thru, % | WBLn1 | 60% | 23% | 0% |
| Vol Right, % | SBLn1 | 0% | 77% | 38% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 5 | 47 | 186 |
| LT Vol | 3 | 11 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 36 | 71 |
| RT Vol | 2 | 0 | 115 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 5 | 51 | 202 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.007 | 0.054 | 0.22 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.41 | 3.832 | 3.926 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 800 | 921 | 916 |
| Service Time | 2.498 | 1.913 | 1.947 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.006 | 0.055 | 0.221 |
| HCM Control Delay | 7.5 | 7.1 | 8.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 0.2 | 0.8 |

### Notes

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; $ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
Existing – Peak hour traffic signal warrant analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This intersection does not warrant a traffic signal during the AM or PM peak hour.
Future without project – Peak hour traffic signal warrant analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This intersection does not warrant a traffic signal during the AM or PM peak hour.
Future with project – Peak hour traffic signal warrant analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This intersection does not warrant a traffic signal during the AM or PM peak hour.
### 803 Waimanu Street, 2nd Application
#### Development Permit Application Testimonies
Prior to January 8, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Testimony</th>
<th>Date HCDA Received</th>
<th>Imperial Plaza Resident</th>
<th>Written Comments (Support)</th>
<th>Written Comments (Oppose)</th>
<th>Written Comments</th>
<th>Email Comments (Support)</th>
<th>Email Comments (Oppose)</th>
<th>Change.org Petition (Support)</th>
<th>Change.org Petition (Oppose)</th>
<th>Comments from HCDA Website (Support)</th>
<th>Comments from HCDA Website (Oppose)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jon Whittington</td>
<td>11/6/13</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>David Lato</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Keith Amemiya</td>
<td>11/8/13</td>
<td>11/8/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chelsea Kim</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Michelle Bae</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lishan Pan</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jean McIntosh</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Karyn Castro</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Daryl Dawson</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kaitlin McHale</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Paula Gene Trapp</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>James Reis</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Shien-lu Stokesbary</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ian Colburn</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Peter Brent</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eric Chang</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Robert Ripp</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cori Simonsen</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lawrence Schmidt</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Johnette Maielua</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date of Testimony</td>
<td>Date HCDA Received</td>
<td>Imperial Plaza Resident</td>
<td>Written Comments (Support)</td>
<td>Written Comments (Oppose)</td>
<td>Written Comments</td>
<td>Email Comments (Support)</td>
<td>Email Comments (Oppose)</td>
<td>Change.org Petition (Support)</td>
<td>Change.org Petition (Oppose)</td>
<td>Comments from HCDA Website (Support)</td>
<td>Comments from HCDA Website (Oppose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fugen Tulgar</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jackie O'Farrell</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Maetha Samson</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Joanna Pokipala</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jon Agbayani</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jamie Louis</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Steven Wolfe</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Wade Shimoda</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Veronica Alvarez</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lawrence Tran</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Catharine Kent</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Leslie Foster</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Noenoe Barney-Campbell</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Norma Tanaka</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ronald Tam</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Valerie DeBeaumont</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Stephen Carll</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Theodore Mura</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Simeon Alo</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Amy Alexander</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Jennifer Decena</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Camille Chong</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date of Testimony</td>
<td>Date HCDA Received</td>
<td>Written Comments (Support)</td>
<td>Written Comments (Oppose)</td>
<td>Written Comments</td>
<td>Email Comments (Support)</td>
<td>Email Comments (Oppose)</td>
<td>Change.org Petition (Support)</td>
<td>Change.org Petition (Oppose)</td>
<td>Comments from HCDA Website (Support)</td>
<td>Comments from HCDA Website (Oppose)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Michelle Matson</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sandra Hansen</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Carl Vasconcellos</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Theresa Russio</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Mari Ono</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Doug Henderson</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Todd Sligar</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Frederika Bain</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Gang Yuan</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Samuel John</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>George Reniers</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Michael Fowler</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Linda Liem</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Sally Flinn</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Edgar Kudlich</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Jobe Brown</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Samantha Grau</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Joan Wylie</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Margy O'Kelly</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Marie Mull</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Alex Addington</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Vivian McBraun</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date of Testimony</td>
<td>Date HCDA Received</td>
<td>Written Comments (Support)</td>
<td>Written Comments (Oppose)</td>
<td>Written Comments</td>
<td>Email Comments (Support)</td>
<td>Email Comments (Oppose)</td>
<td>Change.org Petition (Support)</td>
<td>Change.org Petition (Oppose)</td>
<td>Comments from HCDA Website (Support)</td>
<td>Comments from HCDA Website (Oppose)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Bronwen Welch</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Charlotte Needham</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Stephen Nakamitsu</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Belinda Lee</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Kent Sakoda</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Sarah Devine</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Hapa Holley</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Nicolette Castellano</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Valerie Wayme</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Raymond Pendleton</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>J. Rosa</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Christopher Finta</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Alan Yim</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Gigi Lee</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Daci Armstrong</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Melinda Armstrong</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Patricia Johnson</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Maribel Ruano</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Angelita Critchfield</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Catherine Graham</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Jeannette Kojiane</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Mark Bedard</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date of Testimony</td>
<td>Date HCDA Received</td>
<td>Imperial Plaza Resident</td>
<td>Written Comments (Support)</td>
<td>Written Comments (Oppose)</td>
<td>Written Comments</td>
<td>Email Comments (Support)</td>
<td>Email Comments (Oppose)</td>
<td>Change.org Petition (Support)</td>
<td>Change.org Petition (Oppose)</td>
<td>Comments from HCDA Website (Support)</td>
<td>Comments from HCDA Website (Oppose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Steve Carlson</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Shilpa Nair</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Erica Crissman</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Barbara Lei</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Trevor Wilkey</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>John Jaeger</td>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Cindy Horikawa</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Victoria Lam</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Anne Hyde</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Atalanta Robertson</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Maryam Palma</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Nancy Napuunoa</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Evalani Walton</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Caroline Kishida</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Cathleen Vinhasa</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Stephen Tschudi</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Chris Barboza</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Jamie Ho</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Janel Haberman</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Sophia Kim</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Crystal Moon</td>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date of Testimony</td>
<td>Date HCDA Received</td>
<td>Imperial Plaza Resident</td>
<td>Written Comments (Support)</td>
<td>Written Comments (Oppose)</td>
<td>Written Comments</td>
<td>Email Comments (Support)</td>
<td>Email Comments (Oppose)</td>
<td>Change.org Petition (Support)</td>
<td>Change.org Petition (Oppose)</td>
<td>Comments from HCDA Website (Support)</td>
<td>Comments from HCDA Website (Oppose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Elaine Shirley</td>
<td>11/17/13</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Lani Lofgren</td>
<td>11/17/13</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Francine Popoallii</td>
<td>11/17/13</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Sean McDonough</td>
<td>11/17/13</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Jake Camara</td>
<td>11/17/13</td>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Richard Furst</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Collette Manley</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Daniel Kekahuna</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Daryl Stang</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Elaine DeCarmo</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Margaret Rufo</td>
<td>11/24/13</td>
<td>11/25/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>John and Lucy Witeck</td>
<td>11/26/13</td>
<td>11/27/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Richard Moss, Moss Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>12/6/13</td>
<td>12/6/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Jacy Holman</td>
<td>12/12/13</td>
<td>12/26/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Lindsay Princenthal</td>
<td>12/19/13</td>
<td>12/26/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Martha Lanzas</td>
<td>12/19/13</td>
<td>12/26/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Alex Parnot</td>
<td>12/19/13</td>
<td>12/26/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Arlene Inoue</td>
<td>12/19/13</td>
<td>12/26/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Pamela Wood</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>1/3/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name
JON WHITTINGTON

Address
3048 DIAMOND HEAD ROAD
HONOLULU, HI 96815
United States
Map It

Email
jon.whittington@yahoo.com

Project Name
803 Waimanu

Do you support or oppose?
Support

Comment
Metro Honolulu and Kaka'ako need more housing (affordable, market and luxury)
803 Waimanu Public Testimony Website Submission
DavidLato
to:
contact
11/07/2013 08:50 AM
Hide Details
From: DavidLato <"webmaster@hawaii.govdmlato@gmail.com">
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,

Name
David Lato

Address
1425 Ward Ave.
19W
Honolulu, HI 96822-3520
United States
Map It

Email
dmlato@gmail.com

Project Name
803 Waimanu

Do you support or oppose?
Support

Comment
Please approve this project. Honolulu needs more urban infill projects like this. Also, the project conforms to HCDA rules.
803 Waimanu Public Testimony Website Submission
Keith Amemiya

to:
11/08/2013 03:52 PM
Hide Details
From: Keith Amemiya <"webmaster@hawaii.govkamemiya"@islandholdings.net>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,

Name
Keith Amemiya

Organization
Island Holdings, Inc.

Address
1132 Bishop St., Ste. 2450
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Map It:

Email
kamemiya@islandholdings.net

Project Name
803 Waimanu

Do you support or oppose?
Support
5 new petition signatures: Chelsea Kim, Michelle Bae…
Karyn Castro
to:
contact
11/14/2013 05:13 AM
Hide Details
From: Karyn Castro <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 101 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka‘ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka‘ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

#4 86. Chelsea Kim Honolulu, Hawaii
#5 87. Michelle Bae Honolulu, Hawaii
#6 88. lishan pan honolulu, Hawaii
#7 89. Jean McIntosh Honolulu, Hawaii
#8 90. Karyn Castro Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Daryl Dawson, Kaitlin McHale...
Shien-lu Stokesbary

to:
contact
11/14/2013 10:49 AM
Hide Details
From: Shien-lu Stokesbary <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 162 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

97. Daryl Dawson Honolulu, Hawaii
98. Kaitlin McHale Honolulu, Hawaii
99. Paula Gene Trapp Honolulu, Hawaii
100. Shien-lu Stokesbary Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Ian Colburn, Peter Brent…
Cori Simonsen
to:
11/14/2013 01:03 PM
Hide Details
From: Cori Simonsen <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 172 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka‘ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

#14 101. Ian Colburn Honolulu, Hawaii
#15 102. Peter Brent Honolulu, Hawaii
#16 103. Eric Chang Honolulu, Hawaii
#17 104. Robert Ripp Honolulu, Hawaii
#1g 105. Cori Simonsen Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Lawrence Schmidt, Johnette Maielua, Maetha Samson

to:
11/14/2013 03:39 PM
Hide Details
From: Maetha Samson <mail@changelmail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 182 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

110. Lawrence Schmidt Honolulu, Hawaii
111. Johnette Maielua Honolulu, Hawaii
112. Fugen Tulgar Honolulu, Hawaii
113. Jackie O'Farrell Honolulu, Hawaii
115. Maetha Samson Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Joanna Pokipala, Jon Agbayani... Wade Shimoda

to:
11/14/2013 04:32 PM
Hide Details
From: Wade Shimoda <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 186 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

116. Joanna Pokipala Honolulu, Hawaii
117. Jon Agbayani Honolulu, Hawaii
118. Jamie Louis Honolulu, Hawaii
119. STEVEN WOLFE Honolulu, Hawaii
120. Wade Shimoda Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Veronica Alvarez, lawrence tran…
Noenoe Barney-Campbell

to:
contact
11/14/2013 04:39 PM

Hide Details
From: Noenoe Barney-Campbell <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 186 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

121. Veronica Alvarez Honolulu, Hawaii
122. lawrence tran HONOLULU, Hawaii
123. Catharine Kent Honolulu, Hawaii
124. Leslie Foster Honolulu, Hawaii
125. Noenoe Barney-Campbell Honolulu, Hawaii

[signature]

11/15/2013
5 new petition signatures: Noenoe Barney-Campbell, Norma Tanaka...

Stephen Carlil

to:
contact
11/14/2013 04:53 PM
Hide Details
From: Stephen Carlil <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 188 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ec3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

125. Noenoe Barney-Campbell Honolulu, Hawaii
127. Norma Tanaka Honolulu, Hawaii
128. Ronald Tam Honolulu, Hawaii
129. Valerie DeBeaumont Honolulu, Hawaii
130. Stephen Carlil Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Theodore Mura, Simeon Alo…
Camille Chong
to:
11/14/2013 05:29 PM
Hide Details
From: Camille Chong <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images
5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 188 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here: http://www.change.org/petitions/the-hawaii-community-development-authority-hcda-deny-the-development-proposal-at-803-waimanu-st-by-mjf-development-corp/responses/new?
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

136. Theodore Mura Honolulu, Hawaii
137. Simeon Alo Honolulu, Hawaii
138. Amy Alexander Honolulu, Hawaii
139. jennifer DECENA HONOLULU, Hawaii
140. Camille Chong Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Michelle Matson, Sandra Hansen...
Mari Ono

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 188 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka‘ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

141. Michelle Matson Honolulu, Hawaii
142. Sandra Hansen Honolulu, Hawaii
143. Carl Vasconcellos Honolulu, Hawaii
144. Theresa Russio Honolulu, Hawaii
145. Mari Ono Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: doug henderson, Todd Sligar...
Samuel John
to:
contact
11/14/2013 06:34 PM
Hide Details
From: Samuel John <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 190 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here: http://www.change.org/petitions/the-hawaii-community-development-authority-hcda-deny-the-development-proposal-at-803-waimanu-st-by-mjf-development-corp/responses/new?response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka’ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

147. doug henderson Honolulu, Hawaii
148. Todd Sligar Honolulu, Hawaii
149. Frederika Bain Honolulu, Hawaii
150. Samuel John Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: George Reniers, Michael Fowler…

Edgar Kudlich

to:
11/14/2013 07:00 PM
Hide Details
From: Edgar Kudlich <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 191 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka‘ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

#53 151. George Reniers Honolulu, Hawaii
#54 152. Michael Fowler Honolulu, Hawaii
#55 153. linda liem Honolulu, Hawaii
#56 154. Sally Flinn Honolulu, Hawaii
#57 155. Edgar Kudlich Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: JOBE brown, Samantha Grau...
Marie Mull
to:
contact
11/14/2013 07:17 PM
Hide Details
From: Marie Mull <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 191 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

156. JOBE brown HONOLULU, Hawaii
157. Samantha Grau Honolulu, Hawaii
158. Joan Wylie Honolulu, Hawaii
159. Margy O'Kelly Honolulu, Hawaii
160. Marie Mull Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Alex Addington, Vivian McBraun...

Stephen Nakamitsu

to:

11/14/2013 07:40 PM

Hide Details

From: Stephen Nakamitsu <mail@changelmail.org>

To: contact@hcdaweb.org,

Security:

To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 193 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here: http://www.change.org/petitions/the-hawaii-community-development-authority-hcda-deny-the-development-proposal-at-803-waimanu-st-by-mjf-development-corp/responses/new?

response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

161. Alex Addington Honolulu, Hawaii
162. Vivian McBraun Honolulu, Hawaii
163. Bronwen Welch Honolulu, Hawaii
164. Charlotte Needham Honolulu, Hawaii
165. Stephen Nakamitsu Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Belinda Lee, Kent Sakoda… Nicolette Castellano

to:
11/14/2013 08:28 PM
Hide Details
From: Nicolette Castellano <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 194 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka’ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

166. Belinda Lee Honolulu, Hawaii
167. Kent Sakoda Honolulu, Hawaii
168. Sarah Devine Honolulu, Hawaii
169. Hapa Holley Honolulu, Hawaii
170. Nicolette Castellano Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Valerie Wayme, Raymond Pendleton…

Alan Yim

to:
11/14/2013 09:15 PM
Hide Details
From: Alan Yim <mail@changelmail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 194 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

171. Valerie Wayme Honolulu, Hawaii
172. Raymond Pendleton Honolulu, Hawaii
173. J Rosa Honolulu, Hawaii
174. Christopher Finta Honolulu, Hawaii
175. Alan Yim Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Gigi Lee, Daci Armstrong...
Maribel Ruano
to:
contact
11/14/2013 10:14 PM
Hide Details
From: Maribel Ruano <mail@changelmail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images
5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA); Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 195 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka‘ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

176. Gigi Lee Honolulu, Hawaii
177. Daci Armstrong Honolulu, Hawaii
178. Melinda Wood Honolulu, Hawaii
179. Patricia Johnson Honolulu, Hawaii
180. Maribel Ruano Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Angelita Critchfield, Catherine Graham, Steve Carlson

to:
11/14/2013 10:44 PM
Hide Details
From: Steve Carlson <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,

Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 195 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here: http://www.change.org/petitions/the-hawaii-community-development-authority-hcda-deny-the-development-proposal-at-803-waimanu-st-by-mjf-development-corp/responses/new?
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

181. Angelita Critchfield Honolulu, Hawaii
182. Catherine Graham Honolulu, Hawaii
183. Jeannette Kojiane Honolulu, Hawaii
184. Mark Bedard Honolulu, Hawaii
185. Steve Carlson Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Shilpa Nair, Erica Crissman…

John Jaeger

to:
11/14/2013 11:57 PM
Hide Details
From: John Jaeger <mail@changelmail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 197 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here: http://www.change.org/petitions/the-hawaii-community-development-authority-hcda-deny-the-development-proposal-at-803-waimanu-st-by-mjf-development-corp/responses/new?
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka’ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

186. Shilpa Nair Honolulu, Hawaii
187. Erica Crissman Honolulu, Hawaii
188. Barbara Lei Honolulu, Hawaii
189. Trevor Wilkey Honolulu, Hawaii
190. John Jaeger Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: John Smith, cindy horikawa...
Atalanta Robertson
to:
contact
11/15/2013 02:32 AM
Hide Details
From: Atalanta Robertson <mail@changenmail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 200 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka’ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

191. John Smith Honolulu, Hawaii
192. cindy horikawa hon, Hawaii
193. Victoria Lam Honolulu, Hawaii
194. Anne Hyde Honolulu, Hawaii
195. Atalanta Robertson Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Maryam Palma, nancy Napuunoa... Cathleen Vinhasa
to:
contact
11/15/2013 06:01 AM
Hide Details
From: Cathleen Vinhasa <mail@changanmail.org>
To: contact@hcda@web.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images
5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 200 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

196. Maryam Palma Honolulu, Hawaii
197. nancy Napuunoa Honolulu, Hawaii
198. Evalani Walton Honolulu, Hawaii
199. Caroline Kishida Honolulu, Hawaii
200. Cathleen Vinhasa Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Stephen Tschudi, Chris Barboza... Sophia Kim
to:
11/15/2013 07:49 PM
Hide Details
From: Sophia Kim <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images
5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 208 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka’ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

201. Stephen Tschudi Honolulu, Hawaii
202. Chris Barboza Honolulu, Hawaii
203. Jamie Ho Honolulu, Hawaii
204. Janel Haberman Honolulu, Hawaii
205. Sophia Kim Honolulu, Hawaii
803 Waimanu Public Testimony Website Submission
Crystal Moon
to:
11/15/2013 11:16 PM
Hide Details
From: Crystal Moon <"webmaster@hawaii.govmrcrystalmoon"@gmail.com>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,

Name
Crystal Moon

Address
902 18th avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816
Map It

Email
mrs.crystalmoon@gmail.com

Project Name
803 Waimanu

Do you support or oppose?
Support

Comment
If I had money this is what u would invest in
5 new petition signatures: Elaine Shirley, lani lofgren...
Jake Camara

to:
11/17/2013 02:03 AM
Hide Details
From: Jake Camara <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 209 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

206. Elaine Shirley Honolulu, Hawaii
207. lani lofgren honolulu, Hawaii
208. Francine Popoalii Honolulu, Hawaii
209. Sean McDonough Honolulu, Hawaii
210. Jake Camara Honolulu, Hawaii
5 new petition signatures: Richard Furst, collette manley...
Elaine DeCarmo
to:
11/21/2013 11:11 AM
Hide Details
From: Elaine DeCarmo <mail@changemail.org>
To: contact@hcdaweb.org,
Security:
To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 214 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka'ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

211. Richard Furst Honolulu, Hawaii
212. collette manley Honolulu, Hawaii
213. Daniel Kekahuna Honolulu, Hawaii
214. Daryl Stang Honolulu, Hawaii
215. Elaine DeCarmo Honolulu, Hawaii
Please accept this email as my support for the 803 waimanu project development.

Sent from my i
Support for the 803 Waimanu project
John J. Witeck

to:
anette@hcdaweb.org
11/26/2013 03:32 PM
Cc:
Lucy Witeck
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From: "John J. Witeck" <witeck@hawaii.edu>
To: "annette@hcdaweb.org" <annette@hcdaweb.org>,
Cc: Lucy Witeck <lkwiteck@yahoo.com>

Dear Annette,

We are urging your and HCDA's support for the Workforce Housing project, "803 Waimanu." Due to opposition from the neighboring building, this worthy project has been greatly scaled back in response to the input received and the requests that were made. Despite these concessions that put the project out of the workforce category, the project planners and developers are doing their best to put up an attractive, environmentally sensitive, and affordable housing for future residents of Kaka'ako.

We hope the HCDA will recognize there is a need for this kind of smart housing in Kaka'ako and will support it. It may provide a good model for more affordable housing in the urban area of Honolulu proper.

Mahalo for considering our perspective on this important housing issue.

Sincerely,

John and Lucy Witeck, 2252 Puna Street, Honolulu, HI 96817
MOSS Engineering, Inc.  Electrical / Lighting Engineers
1357 Kapiolani Blvd., Suite 830
Honolulu, Hawaii  96814

Richard M. Moss P.E., LEED® AP

December 6, 2013

Attn: Annette & Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA)
461 Cooke St.
Honolulu, HI 96813

RE: Support Testimony for Residential Housing Project, Waimanu 803

My name is Richard Moss and I am the President of MOSS Engineering, Inc., an electrical engineering firm in Honolulu, Hawaii.

I am writing in support of the proposed residential housing project in Kaka’ako at 803 Waimanu. This building will comply with all Kaka’ako Mauka Rules, seeks no modifications to the rules, complies with the 65 feet height limit and setbacks, and provides the required 20% affordable housing.

Furthermore, this building will provide housing for people that work in or near downtown Honolulu. The residents will benefit from a shorter commute, leaving more time for families and recreational activities. In addition to the residents’ benefits, this will bring added relief to Honolulu’s already overcrowded roads.

Overall, this residential project will increase net benefits to all of the constituents in Honolulu.

My support of this residential project is offered with due respect to the Hawaii Community Development Authority’s ultimate decision.

Sincerely,

Richard Moss
I live on the mainland but have several friends and relatives in Honolulu, and go often. I want to go on record as being Supportive of building the good decent housing for working people. People who work in Honolulu should not have to live across the whole Island because there is no affordable housing anywhere close to their work. Good for families, and so much better for hard working people, who need a bit of extra support.

I hope people who have housing will be fair to allow others to share that blessing. Thank you for caring. Jacy Holman
5 new petition signatures: Elaine DeCarmo, Lindsay Princenthal…
Mathieu Milani
to:
contact
12/19/2013 04:49 PM
Hide Details
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5 new people recently signed Kaka'ako - Do It Right!'s petition "The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA): Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp." on Change.org.

There are now 219 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Kaka'ako - Do It Right! by clicking here:
response=d8c514576ee3

Dear The Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA),

Deny the development proposal at 803 Waimanu St by MJF Development Corp. until the HCDA can provide a list of specific infrastructure upgrades that have been made in Central Kaka‘ako since 2011 to justify the change in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.5 to 3.5. Or in fact, do the necessary upgrades per your own Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Study from 2011 to accommodate additional development in the area. Infrastructure before development! Kaka'ako - Do It Right!

Sincerely,

118. Elaine DeCarmo Honolulu, Hawaii
123. Lindsay Princenthal Honolulu, Hawaii
124. Martha Lanzas Honolulu, Hawaii
125. Alex Parnot, United States
126. Arlene Inoue Honolulu, Hawaii
December 30, 2013

Mr. Brian Lee, Chairperson  
Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA)  
461 Cooke Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: FAR increase from 1.5 to 3.5 on the following three parcels located in the Central Kakaako Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMK</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1-049-050</td>
<td>803 Waimanu Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-049-070</td>
<td>764 Kawalahao Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-049-072</td>
<td>802 Kawalahao Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I appreciate the time the HCDA Board and staff have spent answering questions and listening to the many concerns regarding the 803 Waimanu Project.

BEFORE A PRECEDENT IS SET

I ask for a review of HCDA's decision to increase the FAR (Floor Area Ratio) on these three parcels. There is a reason the FAR in the Central Kakaako Neighborhood was set at 1.5 when Chapter 217, Mauka Area Rules and Plan, became effective in 2011. Before the FAR is allowed to be increased, an explanation, with documented rationale, should be made public. The explanation should include details as to why the infrastructure was deemed inadequate prior to 2011 and what specific improvements have been completed or improvement districts have been established that would now demonstrate the infrastructure has become adequate.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CENTRAL KAKAAKO NEIGHBORHOOD, INFRASTRUCTURE & PUBLIC FACILITIES PROGRAM

The 2009 FSEIS (Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement) and the 2011 Mauka Area Rules and Plan describe the infrastructure deficiencies in the Central Kakaako (CK) Neighborhood. Specifically mentioned are limited parking, rough roads, inadequate drainage, and lack of sidewalks and curbs.

The Executive Director's decision to increase the FAR from 1.5 to 3.5 does not address limited parking, rough roads, inadequate drainage, and lack of sidewalks and curbs that were included as concerns in the original 1983 EIS and again in the 2009 FSEIS and the 2011 Mauka Area Rules and Plan. Nor does it address the lack of Public Facilities or the fact Kawalahao Street cannot be widened to meet city standards. In fact HCDA's power point presentation, found on its website under Frequently Asked Questions: Will there be adequate infrastructure in Kakaako, shows there have been no infrastructure improvements or Improvement Districts in the Central Kakaako Neighborhood.
After reviewing future improvement plans for the City and County Board of Water Supply Roadway Projects (water supply); Department of Design and Construction (Public Infrastructure/Road Repaving); and, the Department of Environmental Services (Sewer) it appears there are no plans for any infrastructure improvements in the Central Kakaako Neighborhood, or any comprehensive planned upgrades for Public Infrastructure, e.g. wastewater treatment, storm drainage, water pumping stations or schools. It also appears these three departments operate separately from the Department of Planning and Permitting, the department that approved the 803 Waimanu Sewer Connection Application. Are these departments aware of the inadequate infrastructure within the Central Kakaako Neighborhood, as compared to Kakaako as a whole?

A July 23, 2013 letter from the Director of the Department of Environmental Services states, “Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA) has not made the projected wastewater upgrade improvements since publication of the revised Mauka Area Plan in 2011. We will follow up with HCDA on the $49.482 million proposed for upgrades.” This department provided a map showing the size and age of sewer lines within Mauka Kakaako. The sewer lines along Kawaiahao and Waimanu Streets, running from Cooke to Ward Avenue are described as follows: 1) 8” 6/30/1897; 2) 8” 4/15/1919; and 3) 6” 9/5/1925.

**CENTRAL KAKAAKO IS A CONGESTED INDUSTRIAL NEIGHBORHOOD WITH INADEQUATE STORM DRAINAGE, RUGGED STREET SURFACES, NARROW VEHICULAR TRAVEL LANES AND VERY LIMITED PARKING, MOST OF WHICH CONSISTS OF INFORMAL USE OF STREETS AND FRONT YARDS. THERE ARE NO CURBS, SIDEWALKS, STORM DRAINS, OR STREET IMPROVEMENTS AND NO TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDIES HAVE BEEN DONE ON THE STREETS SURROUNDING THE 803 WAIMANU PROJECT SITE.**

The Executive Director is using his authority to determine unilaterally the infrastructure is adequate, without any of the necessary infrastructure improvements being made. The FAR (density) can be more than doubled (from 1.5 to 3.5) on any unimproved parcel in Central Kakaako at the Executive Director’s discretion. Existing residents and Hawaii taxpayers need your help to insure “the infrastructure within the CK neighborhood zone has been sufficiently upgraded pursuant to an improvement district or other public facilities project” 15-217-57(c), prior to increasing the FAR from 1.5 to 3.5. If land owners and/or developers are not required to make these improvements, the entire burden will be placed on taxpayers. Is this fair?

Sincerely,

Pamela B. Wood

Pamela B. Wood
ATTENDANCE

Members Present:  
Miles Kamimura  
Brian Lee  
Lois Mitsunaga  
Ralph Morita (DAGS)  
Jesse Souki (DBEDT)
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Randy Grune (DOT)  
Luis Salaveria (DBF)
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Anthony Ching  
Lori Tanigawa (Deputy Attorney General)  
Shelby Hoota  
Patricia Yoshino  
Holly Hackett (Court Reporter)

A public hearing of the Kakaako members of the Hawaii Community Development Authority (“Authority”), a body corporate and public instrumentality of the State of Hawaii, was called to order by Mr. Brian Lee, Chairperson of the Authority at 12:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 6, 2013, at the Authority’s principal offices at 461 Cooke Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.

Development Permit Application KAK 13-091: 803 Waimanu Street (2nd Application)

Chairperson Lee stated that the public hearing was being held under the provisions of §206E-5.6, Hawaii Revised Statutes to review the development permit application KAK 13-091 (“Application”) dated August 9, 2013. The nature of the public hearing was to allow the Application to be presented to the Authority and to provide the public with the opportunity to present oral and/or written testimony. A second public hearing is scheduled for January 8, 2014, during which the Authority will render a decision on the Application.

Chairperson Lee stated that the applicant is MJF Development Corporation (“Applicant”), and the project address is 803 Waimanu Street. The TMKs for the property are: 2-1-049:050, 070 and 072. The project consists of a 65-foot high, 7-story structure containing 153 residential units. A mechanized ground-floor parking system will provide 92 parking stalls.
Notice of the public hearings was published on October 6, 2013, in the Honolulu Star Advertiser. The notice was made available for public review at the office of the Hawaii Community Development Authority ("HCDA") and on the HCDA website. The landowners, lessees and other stakeholders in the Kakaako District and surrounding communities, state and county agencies, state legislators, Honolulu City Councilmembers, and approximately 314 community groups and individuals and organizations were notified of the hearing. Pursuant to HRS 206E-5.6, notice was provided to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House.

Staff Report

Executive Director Anthony Ching presented staff’s report on the Application via PowerPoint Presentation (see Exhibit A). He discussed the project summary; public hearing notice and community outreach; state and county agencies consultation; design review; Ch. 217 Mauka Area Rules compliance; wastewater infrastructure; storm water runoff; drinking water and utility infrastructure; public facilities dedication and reserved housing.

Based on comments from City and County Honolulu agencies and staff analysis of the infrastructure in the neighborhood, the Executive Director found that there is adequate infrastructure in the area to support a density (floor area ratio) of 3.5 for the project. Mr. Ching also noted that the Applicant was not requesting any modifications of the Mauka Area Rules.

Chairperson Lee asked if Members had any questions on the staff report. There were none.

Applicant’s Presentation

Mr. Franco Mola, developer, Mr. Fabrizio Medosi, architect, and Mr. Santa Campanile, investor in the project, were present for the Applicant. Mr. Medosi stated that a presentation on the project had been made to the Ala Moana/Kakaako Neighborhood Board. Mr. Mola described the elements of the project via a slide presentation (see Exhibit B).

Chairperson Lee asked whether Members or Mr. Ching had any questions for the Applicant.

Mr. Ching asked Mr. Mola to describe the stooped frontage.

Mr. Mola replied that the frontage would have a few steps up into a town house unit and are called stoops because they front the streets. Mr. Medosi added that there would be split level units set back from the street and sidewalk.

Mr. Ching asked for a description of the mechanized parking program.

Mr. Mola explained that it would not be a pallet or elevator system. It would be a 3-level system that rotates and functions in sections with 4-7 sections in a row. The parking area would be about 4 feet in the ground.
Mr. Ching asked what system would be used to manage storm water on site.

Mr. Mola explained that there would be a cistern to hold water. The water would also be utilized for landscaping.

Mr. Ching stated that, as a condition of approval, a final engineering analysis would need to be submitted that indicates that the system has sufficient capacity to accommodate water runoff.

Mr. Ching asked for an explanation of the rationale for a 16-foot high ground floor height.

Mr. Mola responded that a minimum height was needed to allow the minimum height for loading and the mechanical parking system.

Mr. Ching asked what the photovoltaic (“PV”) program will energize.

Mr. Mola explained that the PV will take care of common area facilities and lights, and 40% of general power for the building. Some of the PV panels would be used for solar hot water only.

Mr. Ching asked what the floor area of the units would be.

Mr. Mola replied that the studios would be 385 square feet, one bedroom units would be 550-600 square feet, and up to 1,000 square feet for a 2 bedroom unit.

Mr. Ching asked whether a Traffic Impact Analysis Report (“TIAR”) was commissioned.

Mr. Mola replied that Parsons Brinkerhoff was conducting the study. He was committed to implementing the recommendations from the TIAR and any other requirements of the Department of Transportation Services for the project.

Mr. Ching asked what the height of the machine room on the roof would be.

Mr. Mola replied that it would be 18 feet high to accommodate the elevator override.

Mr. Ching asked whether the project would produce rental or for sale units.

Mr. Mola asked for the flexibility to be able to go either way until working drawings are done. He would be submitting to the Hawaii Housing Financing and Development Corporation for various financings, such as the DURF program. Whether units are for sale or lease, it will fall in line with requirements.

Mr. Ching noted that there are differences in the reserved housing programs for rental or for sale units. If a rental program is pursued, he asked if Mr. Mola was aware that there was a 15-year regulation period for rentals.

Mr. Mola replied in the affirmative.
Mr. Ching asked what qualified income level would be used for the reserved housing units.

Mr. Mola replied that it would be 100-120% of the area median income (“AMI”).

Mr. Ching asked what price point would be used for the units that were required to be reserved housing units.

Mr. Mola replied that all units will be under 140% of AMI, but would likely be around 120% of AMI.

Mr. Ching asked for confirmation that all units, whether reserved or market, would be priced at 140% of AMI, or priced such that families at 140% or less of AMI could afford to purchase.

Mr. Mola replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Ching stated that if 100% of the units were reserved housing, the developer would have to secure the required parking for the project within 1,200 feet of the project location.

Mr. Mola replied that they were looking into the parking. If they do not find a site, then the reserved housing units would only be those that qualified with on-site parking.

Mr. Ching asked if the Applicant was aware that the Authority could not endorse the reserved housing credit program until particulars and assurances that are attendant with the program are provided.

Mr. Mola replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Ching asked what might be provided as a credit with respect to the additional reserved housing credits that the Applicant seeks to accrue, and was there any distinction between a rental housing requirement or a for sale product.

Mr. Mola replied that they were restricting themselves to a certain income level, and they had not worked out a program whether it would be for sale or rent. He would be able to provide more information between now and the next hearing.

Mr. Ching stated that the credit program must be fully endorsed, but endorsement cannot be given at this time because of the lack of specifics provided. It would require the Applicant to come back to the Authority and establish that program prior to the Applicant being able to market and deliver such credits.

Mr. Mola asked if more information becomes available, whether he would be able to fix it between now and next hearing.

Mr. Ching replied that the credit program would require analysis. The Authority at this time was
considering the merits of the development program as presented. If the Applicant amends or brings in another program, it would have to be brought before the Authority with noticing and due process requirements met. It would likely have to done after the fact.

Mr. Ching noted that in administering a reserved housing program, the rental program would need to be administered during 15-year regulated term.

Mr. Mola stated that he was familiar with the certification and reporting process.

Member Souki asked where else the proposed mechanized parking system was being used.

Mr. Mola replied that the system is being used in Los Angeles, San Francisco and Denver. The company is Harding Steel.

Member Souki asked what kind of architectural and landscaping features would be used at the pedestrian level.

Mr. Mola responded that there are specific requirements along Kawaiahao and Waimanu Streets which would be provided per the rules.

Member Morita asked whether HECO had been contacted about the PV program.

Mr. Mola replied that power would be used on site only as an independent power producer and would not be going into the HECO grid.

Mr. Ching asked what type of glazing would be used on the windows.

Mr. Mola replied that the windows would be light tinted and not mirrored. Curtains and/or window coverings would be offered.

Chairperson Lee asked whether flipping the terrace to face the Imperial Plaza had an economic impact on the project.

Mr. Mola stated that they wanted support of the Authority and to be good neighbors, so none of the units would face the other building.

Chairperson Lee asked whether the recommendation was made by the HCDA design advisory board.

Mr. Mola replied that after meeting with the Imperial Plaza residents and the HCDA, and they had voluntarily decided to flip the building.

Mr. Ching asked whether the Applicant had site control.

Mr. Mola replied that they were in escrow with option payments.
Mr. Ching summarized the sewer connection application approval with conditions that was received from the City & County of Honolulu (“City”).

Public Testimony

Chairperson Lee noted that written testimony on the project had been received as follows:

- 56 Written Comments (Oppose)
- 1 Written Comments
- 42 Comments from Change.org (Oppose)
- 4 Comments from HCDA Website (Support)
- 1 Comments from HCDA Website (Oppose)

Of the above comments, 47 Testimonies were from Imperial Plaza Residents.

The following persons provided oral testimony:

1. Councilmember Carol Fukunaga, comments
2. Clara Morikawa, opposed
3. John Kobelansky, Jr., opposed
4. Pamela Wood, opposed
5. Eva Gallegos, opposed
6. Webster Nolan, opposed
7. Jesse Ryan Kawela Allen, opposed
8. Gerald Chun, opposed
9. Bernard Nunies, opposed
10. Eddie Johnson, opposed
11. Paula Stuart, support
12. Ben Tran, opposed
13. Ron Schwalbaun, opposed
14. John Horvath, oppose

Mr. Ching announced that sessions for additional public testimony and discussion were scheduled for November 16, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. and November 19, 2013 at 5:30 p.m.

Questions/Discussion by Authority Members during the Testimony Period

Chairperson Lee asked Councilmember Fukunaga if her main concern was extra meetings to allow for adequate public input.

Councilmember Fukunaga responded that information related to staff findings on specific zoning requirements and public agency comments were only accessible by coming to the HCDA office. She felt that the City Council process gave people more opportunity to review specific requirements and zoning conditions and to provide testimony on whether the requirements are
inadequate. The HCDA process is shorter than the City zoning process and provided fewer opportunities for the public to participate.

Chairperson Lee stated that the Aloha Kai development of the Central YMCA generated a lot of complaints but eventually did pass the City Council last month. The Ala Moana/Kakaako Neighborhood Board had voted against the project.

Councilmember Fukunaga explained that there was ultimately very few testimonies in opposition by the time the zoning application was approved versus a substantial outcry when the project was first presented to the Neighborhood Board. The project had been presented to the Neighborhood Board before the application was filed with the City Department of Planning and Permitting. The Applicant and City had a 6-month period to review and respond to concerns raised by residents, so they came out with a solid set of conditions and neighborhood improvements as a result of the project.

Chairperson Lee remarked that the project went from a 150-foot to a 350-foot tower, with 39 stories, 128 apartments with 3-4 luxury units per floor. He asked if Councilmember Fukunaga was not opposed to exemptions or variances as long as there is adequate public input and public process involved.

Councilmember Fukunaga replied in the affirmative.

Chairperson Lee asked Mr. Johnson if he was aware that there are a lot of buildings in McCully that are 30 feet apart.

Mr. Johnson replied that this was the opportunity to change it.

ADJOURNMENT

The public hearing was closed at 2:09 p.m.

Attachment: Exhibit A - KAK 13-091, 803 Waimanu Street Staff Report
Exhibit B - 803 Waimanu Proposed Housing Project

Note: The transcript of this meeting contains a verbatim record and should be consulted if additional detail is desired.
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PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: We are going to start the meeting for the 803 Waimanu Street. Good morning. I'd like to call to order the November 6th, 2013 public hearing of the Hawaii Community Development Authority. The time is now 1 p.m. My name is Brian Lee. I'm the Chairperson of the Authority and I am the presiding officer for this hearing.

Thank you very much, Members. And I appreciate all of you coming out and doing all the work to review the documents for this public hearing. It's a lot of work. And I do appreciate your commitment to public service. Thank you to members of the public.

Please let the record reflect that the following Members are present: Miles Kamimura, Brian Lee, Lois Mitsunaga, Ralph Morita and Jesse Souki.

This public hearing is being held under the provisions of section 206E-5.6 Hawaii Revised Statutes. Again I'm going to begin with some self-introductions.

MEMBER KAMIMURA: Good afternoon. Miles Kamimura, Pacific Properties developer.

MS. TANIGAWA: Lori Tanigawa, Deputy AG.

MR. CHING: Anthony Ching, executive...
MEMBER MITSUNAGA: Lois Mitsunaga. I'm a structural engineer.

MEMBER SOUKI: Good afternoon. Jesse Souki Director of State Office of Planning.

MEMBER MORITA: Good afternoon. Ralph Morita, DAGS Public Works Planning Branch Chief.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you very much, Members, and I appreciate all of you coming out and doing all the work to review the documents for this public hearing. It's a lot of work and I do appreciate your commitment to public service.

And thank you to the members of the public coming here and participating and sharing your testimony and wisdom.

The HCDA is holding separate public hearings for this in accordance with Section 206E-5.6, Hawaii Revised Statutes to review the development permit application KAK 13-091 dated August 9, 2013.

The nature of today's public hearing is to allow the development permit application to be presented to the Authority and to provide the general public with the opportunity to present oral and/or written testimony.
A second public hearing is scheduled for January 8, 2014 during which the Authority will render a decision on this development permit application. The Applicant is MJF Development Corporation. The Tax Map Keys are: 2-1-049:050, 070, and 072. The Project address is 803 Waimanu Street.

The Project consists of a 65-foot high, 7-story structure containing 153 residential units. A mechanized ground-floor parking system will provide 92 parking stalls.

Notice of the public hearing was published on October 6, 2013 in the Honolulu "Star-Advertiser" newspaper. The notice was made available for public review at the office of the HCDA and on the HCDA website.

In addition, the landowners, lessees and other stakeholders in the Kaka'ako District and surrounding communities, state and county agencies, state legislators, Honolulu City Councilmembers and approximately 314 interested community groups and individuals were notified of this hearing by fax and by e-mail.

Pursuant to HRS 206E-5.6 notice was also provided to the President of the Senate and to the
Speaker of the House.

The decision-making public hearing for this application is scheduled for January 8, 2014. Public testimony will also be accepted at that hearing. After receipt of public testimony and the report, the Authority will adopt an action resolution on the development permit application at that time.

Let me briefly explain now our procedures for holding today's public hearing. The HCDA staff will first present its report summarizing the development permit application. Following the presentation we will receive the presentation of the Applicant and then testimony from the public.

Only members of the Authority and the executive director will be permitted to ask questions of the staff, Applicant or individuals providing testimony.

Members, are there any questions as to our procedures? Hearing none, we will now begin our proceedings. Our Executive Director Tony Ching will now present the staff's report. (pause)

I also want to thank 'Olelo for being here and providing coverage. We really appreciate that. And we all appreciate, with our limited state
resources, whatever information we can provide, disseminate to the public is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

MR. CHING: Members, this staff report concerns KAK Development Permit 13-091 for 803 Waimanu. This is a summary of the Project. The lot area is 21,192 square feet. The total number of proposed units is 153. Open space provisions, which happens to also be synonymous with recreation space, is listed at 8,477 square feet. The total number of parking stalls that would be installed or constructed, provided by the Project is 91. There's one loading zone, one loading stall proposed.

The proposed total floor area of the Project is 89,006 square feet.

So public hearing Notice for the Project was published in the "Star-Advertiser" on October 6. The public and stakeholders were notified of the Project. And public officials included the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Association of Apartment Owners of residential buildings adjacent to the Project, surrounding landowners and businesses, the Ala Moana/Kaka'ako Neighborhood Board No. 11, the Kaka'ako Improvement Association, various elected
officials of the state and county, and approximately 314 individuals and organizations.

I note that the Project was presented and discussed at the October 22, 2013 Ala Moana-Kaka'ako Neighborhood Board No. 11 meeting.

The Development Permit Application was provided to the following agencies on September 24th for their review and comment. They include from the state of Hawai'i the Historic Preservation Division, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Department of Education, Department of Transportation's Airport Division, the Department of Transportation Services, City Planning and Permitting, Environmental Services, and the Honolulu Board of Water Supply.

A Design Advisory Board was convened. That's an option with our rules. They were made up of three individuals: Deepak Neupane, who's the director of planning and development for HCDA, Ms. Lois Mitsunaga, HCDA Board Member; Mr. Tom Schnell, an AICP professional planning member and Kaka'ako resident.

Further summary design review comments. I note for you that design review is intended to take place prior to the Project being deemed complete to allow for the design review committee an opportunity
to register concerns before the application is finalized.

Some of the summary comments is that the location would make the Project a good Transit-Oriented Development housing opportunity. I note that, again, these are comments taken from the notes. Question of who builds first or second and the philosophical fairness for development understanding the design can only attempt to resolve so much.

The Project will block some of the views of the adjacent Plaza Tower. However, the proposed design generally is unobtrusive and complies with the 65-foot height limit for that particular parcel.

The design review committee did mention, as a redesign option, that the developer might flip the building layout to allow the Project to face rather than to turn its back to the adjacent Plaza Tower.

I do note that in finalizing the development permit application that the developer did flip the Project to allow, again, the Project to face the adjacent Plaza Tower.

With respect to general areas of the Mauka Area Rule compliance, the Project as proposed
would comply with all provisions of the Hawaii Administrative Rules Chapter 217 Title 15 which is the Kaka'ako Community Development District Mauka Area Rules.

With respect to wastewater or infrastructure questions, I'll take each item in turn. I note that the Department of Planning and Permitting wastewater branch has approved the sewer connection permit for the Project. I note that in 1993 HCDA completed improvement district Project No. 3 or ID-3 in this particular area. And that included a sewer upgrade on Cooke Street. So a new 24-inch line was installed at that time.

It's documented in our plan, but that 24-inch line was intended to accommodate future development along that particular corridor.

I do note for you that since that line was installed the only notable improvement that was conducted and connects to the Cooke Street line, is the Vanguard Lofts which exists, was developed recently, is across the street on Kapiolani --

across Kapiolani and Cooke.

Connection to this trunk line, or this 24-inch line, would be accomplished along an existing 8-inch line in Kawaiaha'o Street. The
Applicant is proposing frontage improvements along Kawaiaha'o and Waimanu Street. And connection to the trunk line would be affected at that time.

I do note that there's approximately a 260-foot distance from the proposed Project to the Cooke Street line.

In any case the developer would still be obliged to perform under conditions of any Project sewer connection permit that is issued by the department or City and County Environmental Services or wastewater program.

With respect to stormwater runoff the Project has frontage along Waimanu and Kawaiahao Streets that does not feature a curb and gutter system to accommodate onsite-generated runoff.

So absent any regional improvement the developer would be obliged, and has indicated their intention, to manage all stormwater generated by the Project onsite. I believe their Project proposes that there would be a sump to take care of stormwater generated by the Project.

In any development permit that's issued by the Authority would cite this responsibility as a condition of approval.

With respect to drinking water and utility...
infrastructure I note that the Board of Water Supply indicates that there's adequate capacity for this Project, although they make no commitment until the final Project application and connection is requested.

Telecommunication and power utilities are widely available in the urban core and are not an issue.

Again, any development permit issued by the Authority would cite compliance necessarily with any applicable agency requirements as a condition of approval.

So there's a requirement as provided in our rules at section 15-217-57C and D of our Mauka Area Rules. So in accordance with that, based on the comments of the city and county agencies offering wastewater and water connection, our staff analysis, our knowledge of the infrastructure in the neighborhood that has been constructed to date, we find or the executive director finds that there's adequate infrastructure in the area to support a density of floor area ratio of 3.5 for this Project.

Here's a summary of some of our rules and how the Project measures up to that. So the building type, according to our rule, it would be
classified as Urban Block. The building form and height according to our rule would allow for maximum of 65 feet in height.

We note that the proposed Project proposes 7 floors rising to the height of 65 feet in stepped floor plates. In other words, it's sort of like a wedding cake. It steps up or it tapers as it gets taller.

With respect to building placement build-to lines is typically to property line or a setback. In this particular case the rule requires that on Kawaiaha'o Street -- and again there's a typo that I note for you on the requirement -- the build-to line would allow the Project to go to Kawaiahao Street on Waimanu. There's another typo, no requirement.

The Project as proposed would go to Kawaiaha'o Street accordingly to the property line and is allowed on Waimanu Street to the property line.

With respect to frontage type: Our plan and rules would allow a stoop frontage. A stoop is sort of like a front porch type of situation. And the Project proposes such a frontage on both the Kawaiaha'o and Waimanu Street frontages.
With respect to a thoroughfare plan that's listed and described in our rules, we note that Kawaiaha'o and Waimanu Streets are recognized streets within the district. And, again, the Project is, again, then consistent in locating and noting itself that they would be located on these 2 thoroughfares and streets.

Open space requirements according to rule is that 15 percent of the lot would be required to be set aside or designated as open space. That would produce a requirement of 3,179 square feet. The Project proposes, again, to exceed that amount with a total of 8,477 square feet.

I also note that exterior recreation space also serves as open space and that's consistent with the cited rule.

With respect to landscaping, that the planner rules would require that any landscaping be native and/or adaptive species. And that is the representation of the developer.

In terms of recreation space there's a rule requirement that for each dwelling unit that there be 55 square feet set aside as rec space. That would total at 55 times 153 units, 8,415 square feet. Again, the Project would feature 8,477 square
feet much of which is located on the second and fifth floors. As I indicated to you earlier, recreation space also qualifies as open space. That's in accordance with the rule.

With respect to the floor plate, which is the size of the residential floor area that can be developed, the rule provides that you can have a maximum floor plate of -- I'm going to have to read that again. It's my understanding that, again, the floor plates 12,136 square feet and that it meets that requirement.

There's no building orientation. "Orientation" refers to tower orientation. We do not consider this as a tower. The building type is urban block. So there's no requirement. It's not considered a tower, therefore there's no tower separation rule that would apply.

With respect to Green Building, which is the Leadership in Environmental Excellence and Design program, we recommend or require that there be LEED or equivalent, and Developer/Applicant indicates his intention to pursue LEED certification for this particular Project.

With respect to flood zone: It is outside of the flood zone X which has that, again, 2 percent
annual chance of 500-year flood.

With respect to parking: In Central Kaka'ako to account for the unique circumstances that many of the existing tenants or operators and landowners find, we as a function of our 2011 rules established that no off-street parking is required to be developed for Central Kaka'ako. Instead leaving it to the market and the landowner to determine what needs to be developed.

The developer in this particular case is proposing that 91 stalls of parking be constructed. In terms of parking access that, again, the curb cut for the access to the parking facility needs to be 22 feet from the property line. At this point the proposed Project envisions being greater than 22 feet from the property line.

With respect to loading zone requirements there's a requirement by rule for one stall. In this particular case there's going to be 2 stalls, one for loading and one for handicap.

For public facilities dedication and just for a matter of background 'public facilities' would include parks and other public facilities that the agency might choose to develop as a function of its Master Plan for the area.
There's an assessment taken against new development in such in that 4 percent of the residential floor area, not counting any space given for reserve housing, needs to be provided as a public facilities dedication. That requirement adds up to 2861 square feet.

Again we note that the developer intends to provide a widened sidewalk, which would qualify as a public facility dedication, of 866 square feet in that widened sidewalk. And that the remaining of that public facility dedication requirement would be by payment of in lieu fee which is allowed with the formula given in rule and as shown 15-217-65C2.

So, again, as I've explained the requirement is 2840 square feet for public facility dedication less the 866 square feet along Kawaiaha'o Street on a widened sidewalk facility which qualifies as a public facility.

You have a remainder of 1974 square feet which the developer-applicant proposes to pay as a cash in lieu fee of $189 a square foot which is a neighboring appraisal for land in the area.

So $189 per square foot times 1974 square feet comes to a total of $373,086 that would have to be paid for to meet the public facilities dedication.
1 requirement.

2 With respect to reserve housing this
3 Project is a market Project so any new development
4 is required to have a set-aside of 20 percent of
5 eligible area or residential floor area needs to be
6 set aside for residential -- I'm sorry reserve
7 housing.

8 I note that, again, if you do this
9 particular calculation I believe it comes out to --
10 I'm sure my staff will correct me -- 27 units as
11 would be the requirement under the reserve housing
12 rule.

13 I note that the developer-applicant is
14 requesting the possibility to retain credits for the
15 remainder of the units.

16 So if you have 153 total units you
17 subtract the required reserve housing, which they're
18 obliged to provide. Then the remainder is the
19 number of units that might be available and used as
20 a reserve housing credit.

21 I note, though, that while there was no
22 onsite parking requirement, whenever you put
23 together or construct reserve housing units you're
24 obliged to provide a stall per unit.

25 So if you do again the arithmetic you
would produce that you could only have 67 units that
would be eligible for use as a reserve housing
credit with the parking that is proposed to be
provided on site.

The remaining 62 residential units could
not be used as a reserve housing credit without
securing an offsite parking within 1200 feet of the
proposed location. That's subject to particular
sections of our rules. Again, these reserve housing
credits could be applied to meet the requirements of
future projects within the Kaka'ako District.

I do note that since the Project is
predominantly studio units, a multiplier of .63
would be recommended to convert eligible units into
credit. The reasoning is this: If you have a studio
unit you seek to take a credit against a 1-bedroom
or 2-bedroom or greater, a requirement that that
would be an unfair conversion. Therefore there is a
discount to the credit that you would be offered.

Again, this is a mouthful, Members, but I
would just note for you again this is a -- this
Project is a market development. It is subject to a
reserve housing requirement which the developer
intends to comply with. They have a -- they are
giving notice of their potential action to create
reserve housing credits that might be marketed elsewhere in the district.

I've tried to discuss some of the appropriate provisions that might be related to the implementation of such a program.

Finally, the developer-applicant is not requesting any modifications of the Mauka Area Rules. As indicated in my summary they are generally compliant, again, with the requirements of the Mauka Area Rules for this particular parcel which happens to be located in the Central Kaka'ako district. Thank you. If there's any questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you, Tony. Members, do you have any questions for the executive director on the staff's report? Hearing none, would the Applicant please come forward to the table against this wall and introduce yourself and offer any exhibits and please make your presentation. We're going to set up the connection to your laptop presentation. Thank you for coming back to us. Good afternoon.

MR. MOLA: Thanks for having us. Good afternoon.

THE REPORTER: Sirs, would you do me a favor and introduce yourselves for me.
MR. MOLA: I'm sorry. I've lost the presentation. My name is Franco Mola. I'm the developer of the Project. I have Fabrizio Medosi, the architect. I have Sandy Capinolei (sic) who's an investor in the Project. I want to thank you for advancing this Project forward. We've listened to comments from both staff, Board Members, as well as area residents.

What you see before you is the culmination, I hope, of a Project that meets with all of the ordinances in the Kaka'ako area as well as, I think, meets with as many of the issues that the adjoining property owners had in the past meetings. And you had several. So we look forward to working -- hearing your comments, working with the staff, continuing and hopefully getting the Project in the ground by next summer. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: We appreciate your persistence and determination. We know it's not a simple endeavor to create the housing in Hawai'i so thank you very much. Hopefully we'll get our setup started soon.

MR. MOLA: I'm going to have Fabrizio go through the slide presentation and then we'll be open for comments.
PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Before you get started I want to recognize Councilmember Carol Fukunaga. The Honorable Councilmember is here and we appreciate her attendance and participation.

Mr. Medosi.

MR. MEDOSI: I will be going through quite quickly the few drawings that I have, explain graphically the proposed Project. By the way, I did a presentation to the Neighborhood Board a couple weeks ago.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: That was the Makiki/Ala Moana Neighborhood Board -- or Kaka'ako/Ala Moana Neighborhood.

MR. MEDOSI: Kaka'ako/Ala Moana Neighborhood Board, yes. And they asked me to return so that they can actually motion (sic) on the Project. But I have to say it was well received. That's my personal opinion.

The Project as you know is located on Waimanu, between Waimanu Street at the end of Waimanu Street and Kawaiaha'o. Right now there are 2 in this location, the existing -- the existing is couple, let's call them anachronistic warehouses, pretty rundown, which proposed would require -- proposed require to be demolished.
On the same property, on the same footprint we propose these 7-story high building. Is there a way for me to look at the next slide?

MR. CHING: Actually they're PDF's so it's difficult.

MR. MEDOSI: I asked if it was difficult to --

MS. HO'OOTA: No, use the arrow.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: The up or down arrow on the key board you're talking about?

MS. HO'OOTA: Yes.

MR. MEDOSI: Okay. This page shows all the Project calculations. I will not go through again since Anthony Ching so very well explained. These are diagramatic drawings that explain in section how the building is organized.

And with one story of the ground floor, one story of parking, mechanized parking, which would allow us on one floor to be able to develop 91 stalls plus a loading zone and one handicapped stall.

The parking stalls -- the parking will not be visible from the street at all with the exception of entry and exit to the ground floor parking. We propose an entry on Waimanu, and an exit on
Kawaiaha'o. Although these might be reversed depending on the discussion we have with the city and county regarding traffic.

It is my understanding that traffic in this zone is very low. Although the whole area seems have been congested. And if you stand on the corner you will see it's not jammed up with traffic. So we actually take care of the parking within our own property.

Then the upper floors above the parking garage is dedicated to residential as well as townhouses on the ground floor to hide the parking structure. On the roof of the building you see over there we propose photovoltaic system.

And on the rest of the building you see the wedding cake requirement for that's complied with my design. You will be able to see that better in the following slides.

This is the parking floor plan. And because it's mechanized it actually requires a total floor-to-floor distance. In this case you see the entry to the parking and the exit on Kawaiaha'o Street with townhouses on both sides and the parking distributed in the manner as shown.

Most of the units are studio units. So
THE plan looks quite busy and compact. On the second floor we have the recreation space which is actually like a court surrounded by C-shaped building. As Mr. Ching noticed we have acknowledged comments from our peers to turn the building around so that it faces Imperial Plaza.

Although if I remember from our previous presentation the previous project there was come some comments against our Project looking into Imperial Plaza. But I guess for this particular scheme there appears it was better this way.

Going up, this is the sixth floor that steps back from the corridor floors and the seventh steps back even further. These are some more diagrams showing the units and the units' distribution with some 1-bedrooms on the ground floor and on the upper floors shown in blue and purple. Then most of the greens are the studio units. I believe we have only one 2-bedroom unit.

These are the floor plans of the typical units. I won't bore you with that. The elevation on -- the makai elevation we propose a series of openable, actually French doors, sliding doors, so the entire interior room is, especially the studio units, feel like direct connection to the outdoor
with railing with a balcony on the outside. From the ground floor you can see the
townhouse type split level units and the exit in
this case to the parking garage. The other
elevation is pretty much a repeat of the other side.
You see the 65-foot height limit with a parapet
which is required by code on top as it is allowed.

This is a section and details of a
proposed parking -- mechanized parking. We found
this company, who is actually an American company
based in Denver, that will provide this system.

In this diagram you can very well see the
open space and recreation space on the second floor
and on the fifth floor on both sides of the
building.

These are 3-D so you can understand the
massing of the building. This particular case
Imperial Plaza would be right here. The building
steps back from, away from Imperial Plaza and
wedding cake's away from the neighboring structure.

This is the landscape plan also showing
landscaping on the recreation decks and the PV
panels on the roof. This is a rendering, bird's eye
view showing the Project in relation to its
neighbors, especially Imperial Plaza, which actually
kind of dominates the Project, especially the high-rise tower.

You can see very well how the building steps away from the mid-rise portion of Imperial Plaza. And it creates a kind of a landscape buffer to it. And this is my last slide showing the other view looking mauka over Kawaiaha'o Street. That's it. Thank you. If you have any questions.

MR. MOLA: Thank you, Fabrizio. That's our presentation and we're open to questions whenever.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you. Members, and, Executive Director, do you have any questions for the Applicant? Tony?

MR. CHING: Thank you, Chair. To whomever it makes sense to answer the question, can you describe what the stoop frontage means to you?

MR. MOLA: Stoop frontage?

MR. CHING: Yes.

MR. MOLA: Well, there'll be a few steps up into a townhouse unit. We call those "stoops" because they front the streets.

MR. MEDOSI: If I may add to this and maybe go back to an appropriate slide. One second. Let's take, for example, one of these units on Kawaiaha'o Street. It's a split level unit. It sets back,
further back from the street and from the sidewalk. Each of these units is districtly accessed from the street. And in order to get to the floor of the units you would walk up a couple steps.

It may be 2, it may be 3 until we decide what the final finished floor elevation of the first floor would be. This answers your question. This is what we understand to be a stoop.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Can you describe your mechanized parking program? Do you envision that it might be a pallet type of system that would be automated, then move and park the cars? Is it an elevator type of system, a carousel type system?

MR. MOLA: One of the reasons that we chose this particular system because it functions in sections. So if something does occur mechanically it doesn't all go down. Each section is from 4 to 7 in row. There's always one left out. So if you remember the Rubric's cube, they figured how to do it with mechanically so that that one space is always vacant. You swipe your card, it rotates, and the most extreme situation would be 90 seconds your car would show up, you get in your car and you drive out. So that's the system.

So each section -- so if it's the 7
section you'll have 21 cars less one. So it'd be 20
cars of parking. And when you swipe your card it'll
rotate until such time it gets to your car. You get
in, you drive out, until the next customer or
person.

MR. CHING: So just for clarification. I'm
aware of the different types. Is it a carousel system
in the sense that it's multiple floors in height and
then it produces that? Or is it a 2-level or 3-level?

MR. MOLA: It's a 3-level system. And that
system rotates.

MR. CHING: Okay. So a 3-level system.

MR. MOLA: So it's not a system where, like,
some of the lifts you see in town for car dealers and
things. You have to exit a car and keep exiting cars
'til you get to the top one.

You don't have to do that. You
basically -- that rotation happens and it locates
your car.

MR. CHING: Do you expect any one of those
levels to be underground?

MR. MOLA: We expect that the parking area,
you see there from the section, is about 4 feet in the
ground.

MR. CHING: So that would be a half
MR. MOLA: Half basement, yes.

MR. CHING: On this subject, again, given the lack of curb and gutter system for accommodating stormwater, do you -- and again the requirement that you then manage stormwater onsite -- your application seem to describe some sort of a sump.

MR. MOLA: Yes. Well, what we might do is actually have, I think we described it last time we were going through the Project, that we'd have a cistern of sorts that is going to hold water. That water is going to be utilized for landscaping. And it'd also be a management program for us for the stormwater.

MR. CHING: And have you conducted the analysis that would compute what the likely amount of stormwater generated in a particular type of weather event? And that your cistern would be sufficient, would have sufficient capacity then to accommodate that runoff?

MR. MOLA: We've down some back-of-the-napkin. But until we know exact -- we still have to set our elevations of the building. And once we get to the point of doing working drawings those will be set. And we'll certainly pass those
along to you with the calculations.

MR. CHING: So would you be comfortable with that being a condition of approval that the final engineering analysis that indicates how your system would be able to accommodate particular weather events?

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: Can you explain your rationale for ground floor height of 16-foot high? I can guess but I was hoping for clarification.

MR. MOLA: The ground floor height in terms of the first level units?

MR. CHING: Yes. Well, you indicate that, again, ground level would be 16 feet high.

MR. MOLA: Right.

MR. CHING: And can you explain the rationale for having a 16-foot high ground level?

MR. MOLA: Well, for two things. One, we wanted to have a skirt for the parking. So that allowed us to create those loft units. So the loft units in themselves require that height as well as we needed the space in the parking structure to accommodate the parking -- mechanical parking. In fact --

MR. MEDOSI: I'm sorry. Another reason also
is to allow for the loading requirement of the minimum height.

MR. MOLA: I left that out. We need 14 feet anyway for the loading. So between loading, mechanical parking, we came up with the fact that we should do this as a townhouse and wrap the structure on both ends of Kawaiaha'o and Waimanu.

MR. CHING: Can I ask what will your PV program energize?

MR. MOLA: Well, we think that with the amount of roof area that we have, we have a group called CADMUS. They specialize in -- that they're an architectural engineering firm. They, they feel that the photovoltaic will take care of about 40 percent of the general power, but for sure the common area lights and all that goes with that as well.

MR. CHING: Just a little clarification. So you said your PV program is expected, then, to cover 40 percent of your common area facility requirements such as --

MR. MOLA: No, it'll cover common area facility. We think it can get into about 40 percent of just the general requirement that we'll have for electric. So our cost will be 60 percent of what they would normally be.
MR. CHING: So the PV program will energize and provide power on a shared basis to your residents.

MR. MOLA: Yes. As well as some of those panels will be solar only. Those solar panels will be used to -- for the hot water system. It will be a central plant as we normally do. And that central plant should pretty much -- those panels will run that central plant in hot water.

MR. CHING: Can you describe an average or typical floor area for your studios, 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom?

MR. MOLA: I believe we have around 385 feet for a studio. Something, depending on the unit type, in the 550 to 600 square feet for a 1. And a 7-, 800 -- in fact I think we go up to a thousand square foot too.

MR. CHING: I was given to understand that you had but one, 2-bedroom unit.

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: And so at this point that 2-bedroom unit may be as large as a thousand square feet.

MR. MOLA: Yes, plus or minus.

MR. CHING: I understand that a TIAR, a Traffic Impact Analysis Report, is being commissioned
by you?

MR. MOLA: Yes. We commissioned Parsons Brinckerhoff to do that study. And we understand that they should have that study completed in the next week or so. At that time we will submit it to you, but for sure you'll have it prior to your next meeting.

MR. CHING: Are you prepared to make a commitment that you would implement the recommendations of such a TIAR and any other requirements that the Department of Transportation Services might make for the Project?

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: Can you tell me what the height of the machine room is on your roof?

MR. MOLA: I believe it's 18 feet.

MR. CHING: And that machine room would be to accommodate the elevator?

MR. MOLA: The override, yes.

MR. CHING: Can you describe the Project in terms of will you be producing rental or for-sale units?

MR. MOLA: We asked that we be allowed to go either way at the time. You know, as we know this economy, we don't know when it starts, when it ends. We'd just like to be able to deal with that as such
time as working plans are done. We are submitting to HHFDC for various financings. So they have a DERF program that we'll be submitting to.

But, again, we'd like to say we're gonna do as far as the sale or the leasing of the units they will all fall in line with the requirements. But we'd like the flexibility to do one or the other.

MR. CHING: With respect to reserve housing units, which is a requirement for the property regardless --

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: -- do you anticipate doing those reserve housing units as rental or for sale? Because of differences, there are differences in the program for each.

MR. MOLA: Correct. And again we'd probably either sell all or rent all. So depending on which way we go with one or the other.

MR. CHING: So in the event that you choose to pursue a rental product for the reserve housing, are you aware that there's a 15-year regulation period?

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: And you're willing to comply
with that particular requirement?

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: In addition, at this point can you speculate or otherwise tell us at what qualified income level would you seek to operate your reserve housing program?

MR. MOLA: I think the way that the numbers are falling into place we're going to be looking at somewhere between a hundred and a hundred twenty. We're not going to hit the 140.

MR. CHING: So whether for sale or for rent you would look to provide the required reserve housing units at the 100 to 120 percent of AMI?

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: With respect to financing, at this point you anticipate that you might seek to qualify for DERF or another program that's operated or administered by the HHFDC.

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: But at this point your financing stack, your capital stack has not yet been finalized.

MR. MOLA: We have a financial stack that's without any of that. But we may -- and the reason why is because if we decide to do all the units in reserve housing so that we can either save those for ourselves
or sell those to a third-party, then we will approach the financing a little differently than if we just do the market rate situation with the reserve housing requirement.

We have spoken to local lenders here and we have the wherewithal to finance it that way. However, if we go the other way and that is that we would use the approach that we're going to either sell or retain the affordable reserve housing units, then we would go and we would work with HHFDC in terms of some of the programs they may have on rental housing.

MR. CHING: I'd like to shift the questions to the remainder of the units not required to be designated as for reserve housing.

MR. MOLA: Correct.

MR. CHING: Okay. So for those particular units, in the event that you choose a capital stack does not involve financing or participation by HHFDC in a market situation, can you tell us at what price point would you expect that those units might be available as or available at?

MR. MOLA: Well, I think -- I think the whole Project as a whole everything will be under 140 for sure. And really our target is to be at about
120. That will comport with your requirement for reserve housing as well as allow us the flexibility to retain credits in the future.

MR. CHING: I'm going to try to be very careful about getting your commitment on this. Did you just say that you are committing for this particular Project that all units, whether reserve housing or market, that they would be -- you're proposing to price them at 140 percent of AMI or price such that families at 140 percent of area median income or less could afford to purchase or rent?

MR. MOLA: Yes. That's our goal.

MR. CHING: So that is a representation and a commitment for all the units in the Project.

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: Can we talk a little bit about your reserve housing credit program that you are -- that you envision for that potential Project. That is dependent upon, again, your ability to secure additional offsite parking within 1200 feet of the Project.

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: Have you identified potential sites for that parking?

MR. MOLA: We're in search of. We haven't
identified a particular one, but we understand that should we not find one that we're going to have to deal with what we have. And that would be that the reserve housing would apply to the ones that have parking. And the ones that don't would not apply to the ones that don't.

MR. CHING: Since you are -- you're still in search of or seeking to finalize that particular part of your Project, and as you can't commit or cannot -- have not identified a site for that additional parking, then you -- are you aware that this Authority cannot at this point or could not at the appropriate time, then, endorse your reserve housing credit program until such time that you provide the particulars and assurances that are attendant with that credit program?

MR. MOLA: Right. We understand that. We understand that we'll have to come to you both with our program both on stormwater, parking, before things get finalized with you.

MR. CHING: Have you established your credit program or have you -- such that if you have a reserve housing -- I'm sorry for the confusion. I'll try to phrase this appropriately.

What is your understanding as to what you
might provide as a credit with respect to the additional reserve housing credits that you seek to accrue? Is there a distinction that you would make between a rental housing requirement or a for sale product?

MR. MOLA: Well, we haven't worked that out yet because we'd -- we'd like to think that whether it's rental or for sale because we're restricting ourselves to certain income level, that we would be able to work on a program that's similar to what you mentioned.

We talked about using 63 or -4 percent of a studio to emulate a 1-bedroom. Then there was a 75 percent, I believe, to emulate a 2-bedroom, and a full credit, of course, in a 3-bedroom. So we would use that program whether it be for sale or for rent.

MR. CHING: Okay. So I guess again, and not to be redundant or repetitive, but that you understand that any such credit program must be fully endorsed with all the provisions made and that such endorsement cannot be given at this time given the lack of specifics on your part?

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: And that would require you coming back to us establishing that program, gaining
our approval prior to your ability to market and
deliver such credits.

MR. MOLA: Understand. I would like to ask
if, if some more information is available to us that
we can fix that between now and the next hearing? Is
that a possibility?

MR. CHING: I actually think that that's --
certainly this would be the first credit program in a
sense that would be established. So it would take
some analysis. I have some understanding of how such
a program might be seen on our side in terms of the
endorsement or the approval.

And I'm not speaking for the Authority.
But I have some understanding of what the mechanics
might be. Whether or not we can work out a program
that you would want to submit, that's something
that's kind of important.

However, I think from a process standpoint
I think we're obliged to consider at this time just
the merits of your development permit application as
you have provided and for under which we are hearing
at this point.

Should you amend or bring in another
program such as the credit program that we're
talking about, I've been trying to make it
abundantly clear, my understanding, that you would have to return to the Authority and we would have to determine if there's noticing requirements for that to make sure that due process is met.

MR. MOLA: So this would be something that will be done after the fact.

MR. CHING: Likely.

MR. MOLA: Okay.

MR. CHING: Again, then just as a, not to beat it, but in administering any reserve housing program, let's say you seek to generate the credit as a rental --

MR. MOLA: Mm-hmm.

MR. CHING: -- you understand that the rental program would then need to be administered for over the 15-year regulated term.

MR. MOLA: We currently are involved in several tax credit programs so we're very familiar with the certification process as well as the recording process both with this state and other states. So we're very familiar with the process, yes.

MR. CHING: So you would not object --

MR. MOLA: No.

MR. CHING: -- to us requiring, again, reporting and any audit requirements.
MR. MOLA: We expect that, yeah.

MR. CHING: Thank you, Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you, Tony.

Members, are there any other questions for the Applicant?

MR. SOUKI: I had a couple of questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Member Souki.

MEMBER SOUKI: So that mechanized parking system that you're proposing, has that system in particular been used elsewhere or others like that?

MR. MOLA: Yes. It's been used in Los Angeles, San Francisco and I believe they have some systems in Denver as well.

MEMBER SOUKI: The Denver company.

MR. MOLA: It's the same company. It's called Harding Steel. They're out of Chicago and Denver. And they make all kinds of lifts. But if you go to their website you'd be able to see what the various types of lifts they have. But this one in particular I believe it's called -- anyway it's the one that's mechanized and not just a lift.

MEMBER SOUKI: Thank you. Then my second question was just on a human scale if I'm walking down the sidewalk what kind of architectural landscaping things you're doing for that sort of human scale?
MR. MOLA: Well, there's a requirement along Kawaiaha'o that is pretty specific in terms of the rules. And we're providing that. Then on Waimanu it's pretty specific what's allowed and we're doing all that. But there is a street tree requirement along Kawaiaha'o. And it's also specific to the tree and we're providing that.

So there's not a lot of flexibility as to it's not like we have our own -- it's been established by the Mauka Rules pretty much in the design criteria for landscaping.

MEMBER SOUKI: That's all, Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you. Members, any further questions? Member Morita.

MEMBER MORITA: For your PV program have you coordinated or contacted Hawaiian Electric on that issue? Because they seem to be slowing down on PV developments, or they have some reluctance from what I understand.

MR. MOLA: I think that most of the reluctance they have is selling manpower. To the extent you're using the power on site and not going into their grid they don't have such an issue.

MEMBER MORITA: So you became an independent producer.
MR. MOLA: We're going to try to become an independent producer. It's the right place to do that.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Members, any other questions? Tony.

MR. CHING: Sorry, Chair. Just one additional question. Mr. Mola, what type of glazing or window treatment do you expect to use, especially on the side facing Plaza Tower?

MR. MOLA: I believe that we're going to be using Window Wall where you see the continuity of glass. And in terms of the balconies themselves those are sliders that will have a small French balcony.

MR. CHING: To be more specific, do you expect that it might be a mirrored finish, a tinted finish?

MR. MOLA: It will certainly be a low rating light tinted. We don't expect to have mirrors.

MR. MEDOSI: No reflective.

MR. CHING: In the event that you operate this as a rental property then would you expect to also offer curtains?

MR. MOLA: I think in either regard we're going to offer curtains.

MR. CHING: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Members, any other questions for the Applicant? I had a question. You've decided to flip the terrace side to face Imperial Plaza residents. I commend you for being responsive for that. But has that caused any possible economic impact or loss by doing so?

MR. MOLA: At this point what we're interested in, we're interested in the support of this board. And we're also interested in being good neighbors with the folks nextdoor. Some point there's going to be construction. And we want to be good neighbors. We want to get along.

To the extent that there's things that we can do to ameliorate some problems they may have existing, we want to help. So anyway we're hoping that this is our olive branch to get, move down the road and to do a good Project and be good neighbors.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: I think we all appreciate your attitude being and the neighbors do as well. And we appreciate they're working with you. If I can ask it a little different way because it is short a concession. It's arguable that you could have had a much better economic Project had you faced the terrace side or the Diamond Head side, that would be a much more than sellable Project, correct?
MR. MOLA: Yes, yes. It would have. But it would also, in my eyes, and I heard Norm Chow say the other day he's getting too old to do these things, and maybe I am. Our preference would have been to do the original project. We had height. But we understand. We understand people's concerns. We understand. We're understand staff's concerns.

When we flipped the building we get views and we get... but I think that by flipping the building and our units I think for, Fabrizio did a great job. None of the units face their units. They all face either each other or out to the streets. So there's nobody looking inside of each other's unit. 'Cause again the concern. That we're happy with what we have. And we think we can execute well. And hopefully everybody else does as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Mr. Mola, flipping the building was also part of the decision that came from talking to the HCDA design advisory board. Is that correct?

MR. MOLA: Yes. It was one with the neighborhood because we had met with the residents when we came up with the scheme. They mentioned that they would prefer us to flip it. We said we would
consider it.

We went to the architectural review, the big one, the architectural review also commented on flipping the building. We thought 2 against 1 we gotta flip the building.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: I appreciate your good faith efforts. And you do understand that there was nothing that could have stopped you had you decided to terrace the building facing Diamond Head, if you decided that's what you wanted to do.

MR. MOLA: Yes. And we did. And again, we're here with an olive branch. We hope...

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: So this was a voluntary step for you.

MR. MOLA: Yes. I just hope -- I run into some of the residents at Starbucks and things. I hope we have a good, friendly relationship going forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you. Tony.

MR. CHING: Chair, sorry. Further indulgence. Mr. Mola, does MJF have site control?

MR. MOLA: Yes.

MR. CHING: And can I ask in what form do you have that site control?

THE WITNESS: We're in escrow and paying option payments.
MR. CHING: Thank you, Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you. Members, any further questions for the Applicant at this time? Okay. Hearing none, we're going to go into public testimony if you can remain there for now.

I would note that since the notice for this public hearing was published on October 6th, 2013 and testimony invited, written testimony has been received as follows: There's 56 written comments in opposition, 1 written comment in general, 42 comments from change.org in opposition, 4 comments from HCDA's website in support and 1 comment on the HCDA website in opposition.

The above comments, 47 testimonies were from the Imperial Plaza residents. Testimony received after 3:00 p.m. yesterday November 5th, 2013 is not included in the list just read. However, such testimony whether written, received at our website or provided here, will also be compiled and made available to the Authority Members and included in the analysis of this application.

So we'll now hear testimony from the public. Speakers will be called up to testify in order in which they have signed up. Testimonies will be limited to 3 minutes each.
Since each Authority Member has or will be given a copy of any written testimony that you have provided, please refrain from just reading your testimony and instead try to summarize your comments in the time you have available.

When you're called please come up to the witness table and speak directly into the microphone and please state your name and any organization that you are representing.

After I call all the people who have signed up ahead of time and registered, I will be giving an opportunity to people who did not sign up ahead of time and want to still testify.

Tony, do you want to comment on the sewer application before we start?

MR. CHING: Members, we were just handed a copy. It's a sewer connection application from the city and county of Honolulu. The remarks are that it reads as an 'approved with condition'. The remarks are that "connection must be made to existing lateral connection to 8-inch sewer line on Kawaiaha'o Street. Sewer connection is also contingent upon HCDA Letter of Approval and submit construction plans for review and approval."

This an 'approve with condition' sewer
connection application and documentation for that
that we just received. Thank you, Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you, Tony.
The first speaker I've signed up is -- we're going to
take out of order -- is Councilmember Carol Fukunaga.

THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Good afternoon.

THE WITNESS: Since my legislative
colleagues are likely to be at the state capitol for a
long time I'm representing them. And we have
submitted written testimony to the board. I'm not
going to cover the written comments, but I think for
the purposes of today's meeting, many of our concerns
have been to really support, you know, investigating
more fully the concerns that have been raised by area
neighbors and residents.

We are also quite concerned about the lack
of information that individual residents and the
public are able to access that deal with public
agency comments as well as representations regarding
staff findings on specific zoning questions like the
FAR ratio from 1.5 to 3.5.

We believe that, you know, HCDA has been
granted a very broad mandate and has extraordinary
discretionary authority. Now that I'm on the city
council end I can well appreciate the need for
specific guidelines in ordinances and opportunities
for the public to comment according to proscribed
rules and parameters.

I would submit that the actions taken by
HCDA thus far, while they have gotten a lot more
open over the last several months, still do not meet
the kind of standard that I think the city and
county zoning process currently allows for existing
property owners and neighbors.

And I would encourage the boards and the
members to adhere more closely to some of the
specific kinds of procedures that the city has
utilized. With that I'm happy to answer any
questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you. Members,
questions for Councilmember Fukunaga? Councilmember,
thank you so much for being here and sharing some of
your concerns. We take them very seriously. Besides,
is it the extra meetings that you're most concerned
about, or the getting the public, making sure we have
adequate public input? Is that your main concern?

THE WITNESS: I think with respect to the
manner in which the information relating to
applications and public agency comments and staff
findings as currently made available to the public. As I understand you can only access that type of information if you come down to the HCDA and personally go through the public file application.

When we go through zoning measures under city council process you have specific written documents in terms of some of the recent actions that we have taken. We have bills that come before the city council. There's 3 readings. There's a series of committee meetings that are held. There's documents called 'unilateral agreements' that are often used to incorporate the specific zoning conditions. You have requirements that are expected to be met.

So people both from the public as well from the surrounding neighborhoods do have an opportunity to review what some of the specific requirements are and then to provide testimony either indicating where they see those requirements as being either inadequate or, you know, fulfilling the concerns that they're raising.

So I think that given the fact that HCDA's process is much shorter than the city zoning process and there are many fewer opportunities for the public and for neighbors to participate, that
there's many good things that now that I'm on the
city end I can say that the city zoning process does
provide to adjacent property owners and to the
public.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: There was a recent
situation that you guys dealt with, Aloha Kai. That
was the Central YMCA on Atkinson. There was a lot of
complaints about bad -- but eventually it did pass a
third reading on council I think just last month.

THE WITNESS: I would also note that by the
time the zoning application was approved ultimately
there was very few testimonies in opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Right.

THE WITNESS: Whereas at the time that the
Project had first gone before the area Neighborhood
Board there was substantial public outcry.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Right. Correct.

THE WITNESS: So that was probably a good
example of an instance in which the Applicant as well
as the city agencies did try and work very hard to try
and identify and respond to concerns being raised by
community stakeholders and residents.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Did the Ala Moana/
Kaka'ako Neighborhood Board still vote against the
project, though?
THE WITNESS: The board had taken a position very early on. So the project was requiring to through, before the Neighborhood Board prior to the time the application was filed with the Department of Planning and Permitting. And the board did take an action to oppose the Project primarily due to the parking concerns.

The city council also undertook a separate series of actions involving improvements, you know true traffic circulation and evaluating some of the congestion and additional impacts that might come about as a result of some of the other development actions occurring within that region.

So I think that the fact that you probably had a 6-month period to review and respond to some of the concerns that were raised, did give everyone an opportunity to come out with what seemed to have been a pretty solid set of conditions as well as neighborhood improvements that we will now see as a result of that project.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Just for the public's information: That project -- the project went from a 150-foot tower to a 350-foot tower. That was approved by the city council.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
And it was a 39-story building with 128 apartments. So maybe 3 or 4 luxury units per floor, right? So I guess what I'm getting at is I think I understand what you're saying is that you're not opposed to exemptions or variances as long as there's adequate public input and public process involved?

Absolutely. Thank you.

Thank you. I appreciate that. Members, any further questions? If not thank you very much for your testimony. The next speaker we have signed up is Clara Morikawa.

Good afternoon.

Good afternoon.

My name is Clara Morikawa. And I'm a 20-year resident of the Imperial Plaza Townhouse. When we downsized to live in a multi-residential complex our most important requirement was for our safety and security. We selected Imperial Plaza because it is a secured building with 24-hour security staff.

The proposed 803 Waimanu Project has undecent setbacks. So it will be built boundary-to-boundary leaving no space between 2 multi-residential buildings. Our sixth floor units
are all occupied. And our lanais will be adjacent
and exposed to 803's fifth floor recreation space
and apartments.

    We're so close anyone can easily gain
access to the other property. Our rights to
privacy, security and safety is jeopardized. And we
will no longer feel safe to leave our lana'i doors
open to let in the fresh air and breeze.

    In our daily lives we are reminded to
protect ourselves and our property and to avoid
problems and trouble. Side by side with no space
between is asking for trouble. We are all concerned
and worried for our safety.

    It is inconceivable to me that any
building rule would allow this. The Mauka Area
Rules says: "Rules are adopted to protect and
promote the public health, safety and general
welfare of the community.' It further states: "Any
provision of the rules that needs refinement or
revision will be corrected by amending the rules."

    I believe that HCDA must refine its
building placement rule and not allow a proposed
multi-residential building in Central Kaka'ako to be
built boundary-to-boundary next to an already
existing multi-residential building. It is too
close for comfort.

Of major concern is the public facilities dedication. Where 2861 square feet is required the Project provides 866 square feet only, less than a third of the requirement.

We were told that the differences paid to HCDA and the money spent to upgrade our parks. This is not right. The developer must be required to upgrade the area surrounding his property.

If this and future developments are all similarly released from this obligation, Central Kaka'ako will never improve and will forever be unattractive, unsafe and unwalkable.

The streets in Central Kaka'ako are described as, "rough and rugged street surfaces, lacking sidewalks and curbs with inadequate drainage forcing pedestrians to walk on the streets and making travel by foot unattractive and unsafe. (buzzer)

With inadequate parking for each unit and the expectation of a more 'walking public' the 803 Waimanu developer is obligated to share in the improvement of streets to make them safe and pedestrian friendly. It is HCDA's responsibility to ensure that it is done.
Accepting payment in lieu of this obligation is irresponsible especially when there's a definite need for improvement. Until a better proposal is made we ask HCDA to reject this Project as it infringes on the rights of the residents of the Imperial Plaza Townhouse. The Mauka Area Rules were adopted to protect and promote the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you, Ms. Morikawa. Are there any questions for Ms. Morikawa? If not, thank you very much for your testimony. The next speaker signed up is John Kobalanski, Jr.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. John Kobalanski, Jr. Imperial Plaza as you can tell by the colors. Thank you, Clare. You've taken all my points. (laughter) So basically I'm free to speak from the hip. That's what I plan to do because I think that's the most important thing to say at this point.

One of the things I want to mention is Hawaii is a very special place to all of us and that's why we're living here. We want to keep it special. Sometimes that means you gotta pull back on some development. Out-of-control development
does not work. It does not work.

If you put 30 buildings that you all high-rise into Kaka'ako you're gonna create problems. As my friend in Waianae was so quickly to point one day, and this guy's a retired engineer and he now farms.

I said, "What do you think about Kaka'ako?" He says, "There's no infrastructure period." I think a lot of people are agreeing with that except the people that really need to do something about it. So the city and county should get onboard if these guys plan to put their Project in there, get those lines up to snuff.

The Project, one of the sewerlines right in front is dated at 1897. It was built in 1897. Come on! How are you gonna put stuff in there if the infrastructure is that old? We need to get going on these things. Traffic is another problem.

And I think Tony agreed with me the last time I talked about traffic in Kaka'ako. If everything gets stalled in Kaka'ako, which is all these little small projects that come in to intervene, then you're gonna create a bigger problem extending outward all the way out to our freeways and Ala Moana Boulevard.
If you create a problem there nobody's gonna be doin' anything. They're gonna be stuck getting to go someplace. So all these little traffic issues have to be figured out now, especially in access to their building. That creates a small problem.

And the problem will extend outward, so the easiest solution to me -- and I have solutions -- the easiest solution to me is create greater traffic throughput in Kaka'ako.

One way to do it is to synchronize those lights. None of those things are synchronized at all. They've never been. I fear to think they never will. I don't want to see that happen.

The other thing that they can do is change some of the markings on the road. Some of those arrow lanes go straight. All these people line up in one arrow lane and the other lanes are free 'cause nobody's in 'em because it's a dedicated right or dedicated left. Some of these things have got to be shifted around to allow greater traffic throughput.

And engineers that do this are smarter than I am. I'm sure they can figure it out. So that's a sewer problem, that's a traffic.
The third problem that should be addressed is the density. 'Cause that Project is very high density. 153 units, that equates to about 2 persons per unit. It's 300 people in the size of a half-acre lot. That's a lot of congestion for the neighborhood. For those people that are in that unit it seems like a lot of people. (buzzer)

Like you take sardines and you cram it into a can. So I think if 91 cars can park in the structure, there should be 91 units available to those cars. It's as simple as that. So my time is up. I thank you very much for hearing me out.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you.

Questions for Mr. Kobalanski? I'll ask you a question.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Shouldn't the Applicant get some credit for working with the neighbors?

THE WITNESS: Oh, yeah, yeah. We appreciate you guys scaling back the Project. I do appreciate that a lot. So, but I think as in the case of anything else, more can be done.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Should maybe that brought to the city council and gone through a 6 month
process and got the original approved maybe?

    THE WITNESS: Yes.

    PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: That would have been
224 feet. You would have liked that project better
than this Project?

    THE WITNESS: No. No, that's still creating
a lot of congestion in a small block. That's why it's
called an urban block. It's just a little block they
just drop in there. So this Project is gonna set a
precedent. And I hope it will set a precedent for the
good of everybody. Then this will continue throughout
the neighborhood. And that's what we want.

    We wanna have a neighborhood that's
sustainable and everybody will look at it as a model
example, not something that's a nightmare that we
don't want any part of. So that's why these
projects are important. The whole neighborhood will
become a nightmare.

    PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you. I
appreciate you. I want to encourage you to continue
working together. Thank you.

    THE WITNESS: Thank you. And happy
Thanksgiving.

    PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Next speaker is
Pamela Wood. Aloha, Pamela.
THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. My name's Pamela Wood. I live in the Imperial Plaza. And right now I'm opposed to the new plans for 803 Waimanu Street's second application. I support the redevelopment of an improvement in Kaka'ako, but I just simply have too many questions to support it at this time until I have more than answers. And I don't think it's the developer's problem.

I think the developer is being placed in a situation where he's got an environment that makes it really tough to make it work. And we as residents look at this and say: It's practical not because of what their building is or because they moved it, which we do appreciate, but because it just does not make sense to us.

The Project site is located at the edge of the Central Kaka'ako neighborhood. The 2009 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement describes the area as a "thriving cluster of industrial uses comprised of many small businesses that continue to operate under adverse conditions of inadequate storm drainage, rugged street surfaces, narrow vehicular traffic lanes and very limited parking, most of which consist of the informal and dangerous use of streets and front yards."
And, yes, HCDA has been responsible for --
as of 2009 you've overseen $203 million in
state-funded improvements. And developers have put
in over $2 million in private sector improvements.
But HCDA has not been able to answer the question:
What specific, specific infrastructure improvements
have been done surrounding this particular Project
site?

The Imperial Plaza -- I'm sorry. What
specific improvements have been made to this Project
site since the completion of the Imperial Plaza in
1992 that increases the density from 1.5 to 3.5 FAR?
The executive director states the Project would
provide continuation of improvements made by the
adjacent Imperial Plaza and surrounding properties
that border the Central Kaka'ako neighborhood zone.

But I don't understand what the
continuation of these improvements are. Will
Kawaiaha'o Street be widened and brought to City
standards with sidewalks, curbs, gutters, storm
drains? Will onsite parking become available? Will
the 114-year-old sewerline be replaced? Will
landscaped pedestrian and public open space be
added? Those are the kinds of improvement the
Imperial Plaza brought to Kaka'ako.
In 2010 this property was being offered for sale and the FAR was advertised as 3.5 on Loopnet, area real estate marketing website. Then in 2012 it was advertised as 3.5 with additional density available. (buzzer) The 2009 FS EIS and the 2011 Mauka Area Rules state it has 1.5 unless improvements are made. Why was the FAR advertised as 3.5?

Are we being asked to rely on the executive director's determination allowing section 15-217-57C that the infrastructure is adequate? What rules are being followed? Is this a 1.5 FAR, industrial Central Kaka'ako lot that can be developed with no infrastructure improvements or parking requirements and limited setbacks and landscaping? Or is this a 3.5 residential lot?

If it is the latter then why aren't infrastructure improvements being made? And why isn't there a minimum of 1 parking stall required for each residential unit? With 153 units --

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Would you please summarize.

THE WITNESS: -- and 92 stalls. Where will 61 owners without stalls park on the already-congested streets? It is within your power to make a difference
in Kaka'ako. Please consider carefully the increased congestion, the minimum standards, the negative impacts this Project is going to have on the neighborhood businesses, our residents, the future owners and the image of Kaka'ako. I thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you.

Questions for Ms. Wood? If thank you very much for your testimony. Next speaker signed up is Eva Gallegos.


PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Good afternoon.

THE WITNESS: My name is Eva Gallegos. I'm a professional registered nurse. I live in Kaka'ako. And I'm a registered voter. I oppose the construction of 803 Waimanu because basically there are a lot of unanswered questions and concerns from the public regarding the infrastructure by the City and the resources that are available in Kaka'ako. These really need to be answered honestly. And they need to be studied.

My training is to take people's health and well-being very seriously. I think the environment we live in is very important. Now, although 803 Waimanu is a Project that may appear to be a single...
harmless building and the infrastructure is appropriate for that building. When that building is added to the other 29 projects that are planned in Kaka'ako it becomes a larger scheme of things, one that when you construct it or plan it poorly becomes unhealthy. Rather than promoting health it actually deteriorates our health.

I'm very concerned about the poor planning strategy that has been taking place in Kaka'ako whether or not it's intentional or it's just happening that way, it's poor planning of the community projects. This type of magnitude of Project really needs to be done more diligently, rigorously and a more systematic way truthfully and consistently. I've been doing my homework.

I'm a registered nurse. I'm not an architect. So when I look at those blueprints it really takes me a long time to understand them.

What I've experienced is that the planning has been fragmented and fractured, divided, uncooperative. People have been arrogant. It's become political. The needs of the community have been disregarded.

For example, I attended a meeting with Mr. Harada where he spoke. And he's the principal
70
developer for 801 South Street. And he was very
steadfast in his decision that a traffic study was
not going to be conducted for the 801 South Street
tower B. Yet a few weeks later he tells the media
that a traffic study is being planned. So this type
of flip flopping should not be tolerated.

It's simply revealed to us and confirmed
to the residents that he's rushing to complete his
project and vital studies like that are not getting
done in a timely manner. Okay?

We all know that the decisions you make
will have a reaction. And every building that goes
up is a new set of problems, and new sets of
reactions from people. They're crucial. They
impact their lives and well-being. We don't know
how positive or how negative it's going to be. But
when you put people and use people as guinea pigs
that's not good practice. (buzzer) You don't
practice on people. The other questions I had is
just -- and this is --

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Could you summarize
also?

THE WITNESS: There are many unanswered
questions. One of the biggest one to have is access
to healthcare. Even though Queen's is there it's not
always available for everybody. So you have an
opportunity, please, to make the right decision.
Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you.

Questions for Ms. Gayegos? If not thank you very
much. The next speaker is Webster Nolan.

THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. My name is
Web Nolan. I live at Royal Capital Plaza. And I've
lived and worked in Kaka'ako since the mid '60s. But
I have a very specific issue to bring up today. That
is the TIARs. Mr. Mola said that he expects their's
to come up in the next week or so. I don't think
there is one. At least I haven't found it for 801
South B.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: You realize this is
the 803 Waimanu Plaza.

THE WITNESS: Yes. That's my point. We
have 2 traffic studies pending on the same street,
Kapiolani. I mean there's other streets involved, but
Kapiolani. We don't know, we the residents and the
drivers and the commuters don't know what's going to
happen there. We need time to reflect on that. But
more than that I have a plea to you folks.

That is when the TIAR documents come out
for those 2 projects and the city is involved and to
a lesser extent the state. Please work together because you're gonna have traffic coming off the freeway. You're gonna have people that are in a hurry to get to work, or late for an appointment, so forth and so on. And trying to move into the 801 South Street complex and trying to move in along Dreier Street to Mr. Mola's Project could result in massive buildups of traffic.

If there's a power outage -- he didn't address that -- but if there's a power outage in those elevators or lifts, or whatever, is that traffic gonna back up on Kapiolani? Dreier's a very short street. And the same thing with 801 South.

There's going to be 1700 parking stalls for that project if you approve Tower B. That's a lot of cars coming and going.

The consultant's report they I say for 801B seems dangerously optimistic about the traffic flow. I don't know if they have ever gone down there, spent some time looking at it.

A good source for that is -- I forget his name -- the man who owns McKinley Car Wash. He's an astute observer of traffic. He'd probably be a good source for you. But anyway, please work together with the city and the state and merge those 2 TIAR's
so the people using the roads will benefit. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you.

Questions for Mr. Nolan? If not, thank you. We're going to continue to 2 o'clock and then we'll give our court reporter a break. And then we'll continue after that. The next speaker I have signed up is Jesse Ryan Kawela Allen.

THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. My name is Jesse Ryan Kawela Allen. I'm a resident of Kailua and I work in Kaka'ako. I oppose this Project for many concerns but the most concern I have is with the stormwater drainage. Have some issues.

I spent the last 3 years living in Princeton, New Jersey where everybody has sump pumps. It's amazing how much water you have to store in these pumps.

I just can't even imagine the size of the sump that's going to be required for this Project and how you're gonna actually handle pumping the water even for your landscaping. Sounds good.

But when it's raining you're not going to hear anything. So that water's gonna sit there, and sit there and sit there and draining for a week, they're not getting rid of the water. It's not
going on the landscaping. Where does it go?

I'm a little nervous. Chairman, you asked the gentleman earlier if you would have preferred that the city council review these projects. I'd like to state that I would prefer the HCDA would operate with full seats filled before moving forward.

Also my question regarding Miles. Your business, I believe, is in Makiki, not in Kaka'ako when I called. So I'm just curious to know the validity of your being on the board.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: We can discuss those things afterwards.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. That's all.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Questions for Mr. Allen? If not, thank you for your testimony. I believe you can discuss with the executive director your concerns afterwards. Next speaker is Gerald Chun.

THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Good afternoon.

THE WITNESS: Chair and HCDA Board Members, my name is Gerald Chun. I'm a resident of the Imperial Plaza. I'm opposed to the 803 Waimanu Project for the following reasons: Kaka'ako sewer
problem is a sure sign of a far worse problem down the road, perhaps even worse then the terrible traffic we are encountering.

This overcapacity of the sewer is going to lead to a health issue when the sewer pipes break and the raw sewage is floating around? Fast buildup of condos in Kaka'ako is only going to hasten the sewer problem.

The residents of various condos in Kaka'ako and people that walk on the streets of Ala Moana, Ward, Queen, Auahi, South and Curtis are already smelling the foul sewer odor. Surely this is not how anyone wants Kaka'ako to be.

Let the city planners work out council resolution 13-267 to fix the overcapacity of the existing sewer system. 'Til then HCDA should conditionally deny 803 Waimanu and all future condos building in the Kaka'ako District.

If HCDA continues to approve more condos to be built and the sewers start overflowing into the streets, we'll surely be in the gates of hell. Be responsible. Do it right for Kaka'ako. Don't have this "I no care attitude." Your children and children to come will thank you for making this responsible decision. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you.

Questions for Mr. Chun? Thank you for your testimony.

Next speaker signed up is Bernard Nunes.

THE WITNESS: Good afternoon, Mr. Lee, Board.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Good afternoon.

THE WITNESS: I'm here today to oppose the proposed development at 803 Waimanu Street. Although the developer has made significant improvements to the design of his building this time around, I think it's still lacks clarity just based on the conversation that was held earlier here today.

Is this property for sale or for rent? What are the units being priced at? That question was never asked and answered. Where is the additional offsite parking going to be? What are the details of the reserve housing credit program?

In addition to this I oppose the Project due to the lack of infrastructure in Central Kaka'ako. Per your own 2011 Mauka Area Rules the FAR, floor area ratio, density for Central Kaka'ako is 1.5 and cannot be increased unless infrastructure has been significantly upgraded pursuant to an improvement district.

Our local legislators agree with me as
referenced by their letter to the HCDA on October 15 in which they question how the density has been increased. Mr. Ching's response was a 5-page letter. In it he states that approximately $203 million of state-funded improvements have been made. But has any of these improvements been made to Central Kaka'ako? No.

In fact Mr. Ching goes on to say that in January of 2007 the HCDA canceled improvement plans for Central Kaka'ako. Our Legislature's written testimony submitted on Monday states that, "The executive director fails to address the question of specific infrastructure upgrades to justify the change in this FAR." The executive director's letter is not a satisfactory response to our questions.

In the staff's findings earlier today Mr. Ching admits that there has been no infrastructure upgrades to Central Kaka'ako. Therefore there's no justification in changing the density. In 2009 the density was 1.5. No improvements have been made since. So the density should remain at 1.5.

Between the HCDA and the city and county no one is taking responsibility for the
infrastructure of Kaka'ako. HCDA asks the city for
their opinion. And the city provides
recommendations and conditional approvals. We
don't know what those recommendations are because
they're not available on the website.

I spoke with Director Lori Kahikina of
Environmental Services at the mayor's town hall
meeting. And she explained to me what "conditional
approval" really means. She told me that
"conditional approval" means not enough information
has been provided to make a determination. Really?
That's an approval? "Not enough information has
been provided to make a determination." So
basically a conditional approval is the same thing
as a conditional denial.

Yet when the HCDA reads a conditional
approval all you're seeing is approval. And you're
basing this approval to allow future development.

This is a finger-pointing game between
HCDA and the city and county with the only people
suffering are those who are here, the residents of
Kaka'ako. The system is broke and needs to be fixed
before any more approval is made. (buzzer)

The HCDA needs to step up and take
responsibility of Kaka'ako's infrastructure. This
Project at 803 Waimanu should be denied until the
developer can provide more clarity and the issues of
infrastructure regarding Central Kaka'ako and
Kaka'ako as a whole is addressed. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you.

Questions for Mr. Nunes? If not, thank you for your
testimony. We have two more people signed up ahead of
time to testify. So we'll see if we can get through
everybody before 2:00 and take a break. The next
speaker signed up is Eddy Johnson. Eddy, you're gonna
testify in support, right? (laughter in room)

THE WITNESS: Probably not today. Good
afternoon, Chairman and Director and the Board. I'm
obviously here opposed to the Project. I do
understand your positions are voluntarily (sic). I
really appreciate you being here. It certainly
conveys to me your care and concern for the Kaka'ako
community. I appreciate that. We're here again. You
know --

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: New and improved,
right?

THE WITNESS: New and improved, true. When
you start a jigsaw puzzle you're left with a big pile
of pieces. Then you got a box top with the picture of
what it's supposed to be. So you start puttin' the
pieces together. At first you put 2 of 'em together.  
Looks like they fit. Shapes right, colors seem to  
match. It's following all the rules. But then as the  
puzzle starts to evolve you get a broader picture of  
what it's really going to look like. You find out  
those pieces that you put together early on don't  
match at all. They don't fit.  

In some ways I see this 803 development as  
kind of like that piece. I still see it as a very  
tight site, very small, and this is such an  
opportunity to make a difference in Kaka'ako. It's  
now this puzzle quite honestly. It's no longer this  
utopian urban fabric that we've been trying to  
develop, what the plan had in place, where we could  
walk and go to places to eat and things like that. I  
can't say much more than what my colleagues have  
said.  

But I just want to touch a little bit on  
the height. I'm right there at the deny level. And  
if had the elevator override, there's floors 5, 6,  
and 7 it's about 42 and-a-half feet high. The  
distance away is about 30 feet which is less than  
the distance of this room.  

That means hopefully with the drapery and  
if they don't there will somebody walking around in
their underwear basically 30 feet away from me,
which is basically -- yeah, right there.
(indicating)
The drawings are okay. I think they lack
some detail. There's some inconsistencies with
floor plans, where walls are indicated, the
elevation's on the windows. There's some scale
problems so it's difficulties for me to determine
exactly what the scale is per se.

I appreciate the questions from the
director regarding the material. What are the
windows gonna look like? Right now it's kinda
lollipop trees and things like that.

It would be nice to see a bit more detail
in terms of what it's really going to look like.
Also just applying my architect's math to the
infrastructure problem, I gather it's from 1897 back
just shortly after the Civil War maybe.

153 units: Bathroom, toilet, sink,
shower, kitchen sink, dishwasher, throw in the
garage. If you add those fixtures up, just rough
math, an 8-inch line's not gonna come in. After a
hundred plus years maybe that diameter is down to 6
at this point. (buzzer)

So I think they're gonna have to replace a
line. It's part of the infrastructure problem. So
the line can't just be fixed from 803 to Cooke.
You've got all of Kawaiaha'o to do. Who's gonna do
that? I think that's going to be required to make
it happen. So thank you for your time.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you.
Questions for Mr. Johnson? Mr. Johnson, as an
architect you're aware that there are a lot of modern
buildings in the McCully-Moili'iili area, that area
that are 30, 40, 50 feet apart from each other?

THE WITNESS: I tried looking at Google
Earth. Kind of flew around. Trying to get some
measure here and there. But the exposure of this,
it's, again, there's a wall indicated. Looks like
there's a kitchenette that side is facing.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: But you're aware
that there are a lot of similar situations much
tighter than what they're proposing in the urban core
area.

THE WITNESS: Not much tighter. This is an
opportunity to change that. I guess I'm saying do we
not -- is not the opportunity to change that?

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Okay.

THE WITNESS: And I just wanted to point
that you had mentioned Mr. Mola took the opportunity
to flip the building. That was his discretion. My question back to you is it not your folks' discretion to approve that?

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: I guess my point was he could have done it if he wanted to. Fortunately he decided to work with you.

THE WITNESS: But you would have approved or denied whether that was allowable. Because 65 feet is allowable. It's not required.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you. Thanks. All right. Any other questions? If not, thank you.

Last speaker signed up ahead of time is Paula Stuart. I believe I saw -- unfortunately she has left. Oh, here you are.

THE WITNESS: My name is Paula Stuart, 20 year Kaka'ako resident. I'm an interior designer/sociologist. I was at the first presentation that you gave. And I am really delighted you put a more appropriate scale you've drawn it down to. My notes are real scattered, if I didn't already say that.

I think you're really to be commended greatly for making it more of a small village appropriate feeling. I do wish it were less boxy looking, but in place of some tall tower. But I do wish it were a more beautiful building. Maybe the
expense is constrained.

I do think there should be more economical things that could be done to make it look more charming and more appropriate to Hawaii. It's kind of a non-descript building as the plans call for. I didn't get to look at the plans when I came in shortly past noon. The plans weren't on the table in the entry there yet. So I wish I had more time to study the plans.

I don't think the windows of the 2 buildings should be facing each other for reasons that this last man I think mentioned. If a woman is going around with her slip or a man with his boxers is not going to feel very comfortable to have people looking in.

I would think the residents of the Imperial Plaza if they're apprised of the changes that you've made, they would be highly knowledgable about what it is to live with a building constructed so as the neighbor would be.

The building that I'm in on Halekauwila Street the first two times I testified on that I think I made myself clear I presented a lot of objections.

The third time I was so exhausted beyond
exhaustion I almost had to have a stretcher bring me in here. I think some of the things that I said probably were not clear, and may have been misunderstood.

I'm still against the 404 Ward Project that they've renamed Halekauwila Street, a 900 Halekauwila Street number. I think that that 404 Ward Project really does need to be modified greatly because it would be a real hardship for people in my building. And I note that you've said you want to avoid hardship. (buzzer).

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Could you please summarize the rest of your comments.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I have a son who's grown and recently married his long-time girlfriend. And he isn't planning on having children. I think it would be nice if they lived in the Kaka'ako area. I'm concerned about some of the problems that I foresee in the Kaka'ako area and that already exist here. It's making it not a good place to live both for the current residents and future residents.

My son was born and raised here, has always lived here except for one year. And loves -- he wants to stay here. I think you're passing, that the board is passing things too easily. I think
there should be strict standards. There shouldn't be all these variances that even if it takes 15 times of turning down plans the developers have. They can always retry, even if it takes 20 times of turning them down and reworking the plans.

And I understand their position of wanting to stay flexible on rental or sales because the economy is so unpredictable when the market has gotten saturated. No one knows when that point is gonna be reached and it's gonna affect developers' sales. I guess I've said everything. Thank you for giving me the extra time. Are there any questions or comments?

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Any questions for Ms. Stuart? If not, thank you. I appreciate your -- and respect your even-handed and fair comments pro and con. That really adds to your credibility when you can look at things fairly.

THE WITNESS: Thank you for your comment.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Is there anyone else right now who did not register ahead of time that would like to offer their comments or testimony? Please come forward. Please state your name and your organization if you're affiliated with one. So you haven't registered. So are you with St. Louis High
School or Imperial Plaza? (laughter)

THE WITNESS: My name is Van Trang. I live in Kaka'akos. I was born in Viet Nam, and growing ups in Viet Nam, Hong Kong and Japan. As you know we have seen the fast growing economically growing in that areas. They set a presence. I mean before they were, have a lot of regulations. But when the economy got in those areas the authorities over there all of a sudden change their law. So it allowed boundary to boundary build all kind of building in Tokyo and Viet Nam right now.

I'll make the story short. I would really like HCDA to seriously consider all the new developments here, especially those with a very, very limited size of buildings like 803 Waimanu Street.

I'm not against of new developments. But we must be careful to set -- must be not to set a bad record for the later developments.

Finally, I have a hypothetical question for the HCDA. And I have seen the developers in Viet Nams, Tokyos and Hong Kong has done. Once the developer make all kinda promise. But during or after complete of the project they didn't comply. They said, "Sorry. This is not going to -- I cannot
keep my promise." What happens? I want to build a law in this country. If a developer cannot keep his promise as he promised during or after the development what is the result? Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions for the speaker? Could you register your name with Annette in the back so we can have it for our records. Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify at this time who did not sign up? Please come forward.

THE WITNESS: If I don't wear these sunglasses I won't be able to see.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: That's fine.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. I'm Ron Schwab. I'm a 40-year resident of Kaka'ako. I commend the developer for scaling back. I think the building's a beautiful design. The question is: Does it belong adjacent or abutting an existing residential complex? Other issues on FAR, sewage and so forth are concerns. Possibly Kaka'ako really needs another pumping -- sewage pumping station. I can tell you we're living up to our name as far as Kaka'ako because the stench is bad. I don't want it to be known as Kaka-ako. I'd like to be proud of it as 40 year resident. So I thank you for your time. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you for your testimony. Could you please register in the back. Questions for the speaker? If not, thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to offer their comments or testimony? Please come forward. Mr. Horvath?

THE WITNESS: I'm John Horvath, resident manager of One Waterfront Towers. To just touch on the sewer issues, I've been working with the city and county officials R. M. Towill to figure out kinda what's goin' on. And it's really not a capacity as it is understanding how the system works. There are anomalies within the system that create negative impacts to the community.

There's positive air pressures being generated that cause the stench to back up and produce that foul order which can be mitigated. The pumping station, which this work on Auahi Street seems to be part of, there's cause and effect with that when the pumps are switched on and off. There's, like, belches back through the system causing smells and backups and things, whatever.

Basically from what I've seen is they're intelligent diligent people working towards figuring this problem out. It's not like it's an end game or a mind blowing thing to figure out. It's pretty
simple. And it will be figured out. But it does need to be figured out before we add any other variables to the equation.

I know there's a city council bill or Resolution 13-267 requiring a moratorium on building. I do support that. I think it needs to be addressed. There needs to be a systematic approach to the sewer problem. It's not just a sanitary sewer. There's a big groundwater -- maybe even the ocean water issue.

Along South Street we have 2 manhole covers that as we speak thousands of gallons of groundwater are infiltrating the sanitary sewers which is obviously not a good thing.

The sewage that enters into Kaka'ako comes as far away as Kuliouou. That's part of the system and I've asked some questions like: How long does it take for that sewage to travel from Kuliouou to Kaka'ako? Is it becoming aerobic? Meaning it's growing. It's festering. It's smelling. It's that issue that's taken place. Haven't gotten answers to those questions. I suggest that they drop some dye down in Kuliouou and track and see.

Again, these are the type of things I hope take place and we understand more about the system.
and what's going on before we continue to impact not only the people that are living here but potentially new people that are gonna come into the equation as well.

Think I speak for everybody, the people here. Everybody I think wants a SMART development, a beautiful community. They want all the fringe benefits of that. Let's kind of follow the process of taking care of the infrastructure and answering all these questions first. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you.

Questions for Mr. Horvath? If not thank you very much for your testimony, for working at the City. Thank you. Is there anyone else at this time wishes to testify or offer their comments or testimony? Last call.

If not, if there's no other person here wishing to testify at this time, this initial public hearing for the development permit application KAK 13-091 is closed. The decision-making hearing on this application is scheduled for January 8th, 2014.

On behalf of the HCDA Authority Members and its hard working staff, I want to thank you all for participating in this democratic process. I want to thank the Board Members for all of your
homework for being involved and the Applicant for your enterprise and for your determination and diligence. This hearing now stands adjourned. I'm sorry. Scratch that. Tony.

MR. CHING: So for members of the audience, on November 16th and 19th we will have additional opportunity for testimony and discussion on a more informal basis. Subsequently we will also have another opportunity, two opportunities, in December to also supplement the record. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER LEE: Thank you, Tony. I really do encourage you to participate. We do listen to your concerns. We agonize over them even though we look like, you know, we're not listening. We do take them very seriously. We know that the Project and the community will be a lot better with your participation. Thank you very much. This meeting is now adjourned.

(The proceedings were adjourned at 2:10 p.m.)
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MR. CHING: Good morning, everyone. If you didn't know it's Saturday the 16th. It's just after 10 o'clock. My name is Anthony Ching. I'm the Executive Director of the Hawaii Community Development Authority, but today I'm serving as our Hearings Officer. We will be taking in turn -- as I look at our sign-up list, we have people signed up for 801 South Building B or Tower B. That will be first up we'll be soliciting public testimony.

Then the next one will be for 803 Waimanu. And then just generally I have a subject heading that I'll be taking that in order.

After we finish our public testimony portion we will shift to the more informal community briefing portion where there's an ability for interchange.

Anyway, based on Authority action on June 19 the Hawaii Community Development Authority Kaka'ako Authority authorized the Executive Director to schedule and conduct supplemental public comment sessions. This is designed to augment, not replace, public hearings that have already been scheduled.

Typically every third Tuesday in an evening time, evening setting, I would conduct a community briefing. It's a chance to, again, speak
informally to staff at that time about upcoming agenda items and items of interest. But at this point we will be taking public comment on two development permit applications that are before the Authority at this time. That's in the Kaka'ako District.

All comments received for each of these development permits will be captured by our court reporter and forwarded to the Authority for their review.

If you previously provided testimony at our public hearing those testimonies are already a part of the record. There'll be no presentations by the Applicants. However, their presentations and their materials are available at that table on the wall. They're available for viewing at that table. Please do not remove these materials from the room as they are intended for all to view. Unfortunately at our last time one copy seemed to walk away.

Our procedure for today is that I'll be taking comments in turn for KAK13-057 which is 801 South Street Phase 2, Applicant Downtown Capital, LLC. And then KAK13-091 which is 803 Waimanu Street.

After testimony for each Project has been
taken I will dismiss our court reporter and we'll discuss informally with all present those questions that they might have had for any agency activities in the format of our regular community briefing.

So again and without further adieu, I have a signup list that I'll be taking in order. If you haven't had a chance to sign up, please don't worry. At the end of the list I'll see if there's anybody else who is interested in providing comments.

I'd also note for you that consistent with the rules or the procedures at our regular public hearing, each individual is offered 3 minutes to provide their testimony, again, which will be recorded by our court reporter.

In the event that you seek to piggyback, we still give you the 3 minutes but we want each person present to give their testimony. So that maintains the consistency of everybody having their shot at doing this and much as the Authority would hear.

Of course, we won't stop if there's even more people coming. We will continue to accept testimony. We will do this again on Tuesday at 5:30. Okay?

So again we'll start off. I'll just
briefly introduce that KAK13-057, 801 South Street Phase 2. The Applicant is Downtown Capital, LLC. The Project address is at 801 South Street. The Project proposes to redevelop a partial city block and will consist of multiple structures including an approximately 46-story, 400-foot high residential tower with approximately 480,153 square foot of floor area fronting Kapiolani Boulevard.

The tower includes approximately 410 units comprised of a mix of 1, 2 and 3-bedroom units. The first story of the tower includes a lobby, lounge, mechanical room, trash room, staff spaces, residential units and open space along Kapiolani Boulevard.

The remaining stories floors 2 to 46 are dedicated to residential units. Access to the proposed adjacent parking garage is from the ground floor. It also includes approximately a 10-story, 107-foot high parking garage with approximately 18,770 square foot footprint fronting South Street.

The parking garage is partially surrounded by the existing Honolulu Advertiser Building on the corner of Kapiolani Boulevard and South Street. The parking garage is not attached but is accessible to the residential structure, Tower B, fronting
Kapiolani Boulevard.

The Applicant proposes a number of modifications which are allowed in our rules for such a Project. Those modifications include 1. An increased building height of 107 feet for the free-standing parking garage from the maximum 45 feet allowed.

With respect to loading spaces they propose one large and two smaller loading spaces instead of the required two large and two smaller loading spaces.

Modification with respect to landscaping: They propose landscaping that is not consistent with what is required for a terrace front frontage type.

With respect to fences and frontage type -- I'm sorry. With respect to fences they propose an increase in the fence height along Kapiolani Boulevard to 6 feet from a maximum 3 feet that is allowed.

With respect to Green Building standards they propose to, that the building will not meet base qualifications of LEED rating or other green building rating system.

With respect to curb cuts, they propose a curb cut that's placed 6 feet 3 inches from the
adjacent property line instead of the minimum 22 feet required. Then, finally, they propose -- with respect to building placement, they propose a build-to line of 22 feet greater than the 5 feet, 5 to 10 feet that's allowed. The build-to line is typically the property line along the Kapiolani Boulevard frontage. Again, the requirement would be typically 5 to 10 feet. And they propose a greater setback of 22 feet.

Again, I'll note for you as we start this our objective is to hear comments, then try to, well, sincerely hear and then be able to respond or be able to analyze the comments made and then incorporate that into a record for the Authority and as well as for staff analysis.

So with that introduction for KAK13-057, my first person wanting to testify, I understand you're going to be doing it in a group, is Stefan Lavallee. Then next it would include Sonny Gay, Ariel Salinas. I'm going to just say, because you're indicating you're going to be sort of testifying in tandem, I'm just going to call your names out instead for recognition: Ron Okamura, Louise Black, Grace Ishihara, Cara Kimura, Ewa Gallegos, Mary Caywood.
So just a reminder for each of you you have 3 minutes. Is the PowerPoint an integral part of your presentation? If so I'll wait while you set it up.

MR. LAVALLEE: Yes, it is.

MR. CHING: So we'll just take a little break until you're ready. "No wine before its time".

(pause)

So I'll note for you folks that we're videoing the public testimony portion so that there's always a video record. That's just full acknowledgment that you're on camera.

I'll note that as we answer questions to make sure that it's said once, the same thing is then given to people who will post it at our website.

So the testimony portion is just, if you know our regular hearings are covered by Olelo. So there's a record already. So it sort of augments that same record. So we're not going to post the hearing per se. You can go to 'Olelo.

The community briefing portion, what we're speaking more on topics and there's an interchange that would be necessarily at our website. We'll try to edit it so that it fits, so it works just so that
you have that advance. Okay?

MR. LAVALLEE: Okay.

MR. CHING: So let's start, Mr. Lavalle.

MR. LAVALLEE: Good morning. My name is Stefan Lavalle. I'm with the group Kaka'ako Cares. We are for affordable workforce housing. However, we oppose 801 South Street Tower B. This morning our group will be doing a presentation covering the Tower B and the workforce affordability sham, profiteering at the expense of the community.

We're going to talk about traffic congestion, insufficient sewer flows, insufficient school capacity, insufficient recreation space and safety compromises for our community in Kaka'ako.

In reviewing the developer's proposal we have found nine serious errors. I'm sure you've come across them as well. We'd like to highlight a few of them this morning.

For example: The income adjustment, according to HUD, the developer's using a household size of 2. It should be .8, 80 percent for the calculation. The developer's using .9. Household size assumption is very generous for the developer. Mortgage insurance premiums are underestimated. Real property taxes are underestimated. Association
dues are unbelievably low. And we think they are incorrect.

They're underinsured. The developer's also factoring in no homeowners insurance when these applicants get a mortgage. I'm not sure what bank offers a mortgage without somebody having homeowners insurance. Utilities are not factored into the developer's calculations. As far as I know everybody's gonna pay utilities.

Another assumption in error we found is that nobody buys a second parking stall, even those 1.93 stalls per unit. Tower B is primarily 2 and 3 bedrooms. So household of 2 you'd assume they'd have a couple cars.

The most alarming error we found is the developer's using an interest rate for their mortgages of 2.9 percent. Currently banks, local banks, are qualifying people for 801 South Street Tower B at 5 and-a-half percent because the building's not developed. They're not gonna give you a mortgage of 2.9. So that's a complete error there. Thank you. Thank you. (buzzer)

MR. SALINAS: Good morning. My name is Ariel Salinas. I'm here to talk about some of the affordability aspects of this Project as well. There
was a marketing pitch where the developer got the
police officer with 10 years on the job, and a teacher
who wants to teach in Hawaii but is tired of renting.
The young still wanna start a business. What had
happened, they ran a full page ad in the Star
Advertiser about that.

In reality, virtually none of the units in
Tower B will actually be affordable for any of these
types of families. You can see that the maximum
affordable price for somebody making $65,000 a year
is well below any of the 1-bedroom units that the
developer has in the building.

So we'll provide you these slides for
public testimony a little bit later, but I wanted to
go into a live demonstration just to show some real
draws of what happens with all the generous
estimations that the developer's providing. Is that
not going to project? (PowerPoint displayed)

All right. So this is a map of the
building. This shows all the units how affordable
they are. Green is good. Red's bad. So the red
strip down the middle is a 3-bedroom, 2-bath unit
that don't qualify for workforce for the developer
because they exceed the maximum size.

What I've done with it I went through all
the developer's calculations and found all the issues, all the cascading errors, omissions and generous assumptions that they made. If you fix the income scaling issue that Stefan pointed out, you have a building that starts looking like this when you use the right income scaling per the different unit size.

You fix the mortgage interest rate 5 and-a-half percent, that we actually found that the banks were qualifying for, and the building starts looking like this. Red is bad. Red exceeds 140 percent of the area median income. Then right away we're at 48 percent of units that don't qualify for workforce housing. Just fixing two issues.

THE REPORTER: Could you slow down just a bit.

MR. SALINAS: Yes, ma'am. Then instead of using the underestimate for real property tax and the underestimate for mortgage insurance premium, I'll calculate actuals and I'll show you what happens when you put actual figures over there.

Let me start with actuals and the whole building starts -- the red starts creeping down from the higher floor units down to the bottom.

Now, homeowners insurance let's put
realistic values in there: 50, 45 and 40 a month.

You can see affordability starts plummeting. Then if you assume that the 2-bedrooms and 2-baths have one extra parking stall, which is legitimate, starts getting even more red.

And then, finally, the last thing I'll do is I'll just put realistic association dues in over here. Because the ones that the developer provided aren't legitimate, and I can prove that if I have enough time. (baby crying) And here's the final picture of the building where you can see primarily this whole building is just red.

With the few units that are obstructed by the Advertiser Building, or the few units that are obstructed by the 10-story parking garage have limited affordability for those making under 140 percent area median income.

I found that the burden to get into the building's about 135 percent just to get in if you factor in realistic assumptions, if you correct the errors that were made and if you don't allow the developer to get away with withholding generous estimates that they are providing to HCDA.

So the purpose of this demonstration is just to show the systematic debunking of what the
developer provided, 9 errors, omissions or generous assumptions that we correct for. And we can show that virtually the entire building doesn't qualify. They have to meet the 75 percent threshold. In reality there's virtually none of these units actually meet any of the intent of the law of providing affordable workforce housing.

So switching back now to the PowerPoint. Okay. I think I got it. In conclusion do not meet even the basic 75 percent requirement of the law. The permit must be denied because asking for density, parking structure, Kapiolani frontage modifications, public facilities modifications, not doing Green Building standards, not providing parking access in accordance with the rules and building placement.

It's irregular. It violates the minimum rules that are set to specify the health, safety and welfare of the community. We really feel strong that the affordability of this thing seemed to be the main reason why it was proposed in the first place, and the only reason, the only justifying reason behind modifying or avoiding any of these rules. Thank you for your attention.

MR. CHING: Mr. Salinas, I'd like to ask you
some questions. You indicated that you can prove that
his CAM fees are indefensible.

    MR. SALINAS: Yes.

    MR. CHING: You said you could prove it.

    MR. SALINAS: Okay. I'll prove it. So I went to Tower A. If you assume Tower A has been in
the works longer than Tower B, and assume that their
association fees are more in line with what's actually
gonna -- what's actually gonna be real for the people
that are living in there, there are 680 units in Tower
A.

    MR. CHING: 635.

    MR. SALINAS: Okay. 635. (baby crying. Inaudible). So if you go to each unit, calculate the
total association dues per unit and add that up you
get $160,000 a month approximately. So that's the
total operational cost estimated for that building
Tower A.

    Now, if you assume that Tower B is gonna
be of similar operational costs, it's the same
footprint, approximately the same size. Everything
is apples-to-apples just about the same. It's just
the unit sizes are different. So the property is
just about the same.

    If you assume that those operational costs
are going to be comparable within a few percent of each other, which I think is a reasonable assumption, then you do that same calculation, calculate all the listed association dues for each unit and add that up. And you get about $119,000 a month. What that amounts to is a 37 percent underestimate of the operational costs for Tower B versus Tower A.

So I think that that is sufficient proof for HCDA to go back to the developer and back up their claims for their association dues. 'Cause all that they provided was just a number in their permit application. So there's significantly less units, larger size that divide-by-number's a lot smaller. So the maintenance fee the association dues per unit will necessarily have to be higher.

So I think that's something that HCDA can perhaps ask the developer for more information about, substantiate. 'Cause from a living in Honolulu and Kaka'ako perspective the $305 a month for a 2-bedroom association dues seems outrageous for a 2-bedroom with nearly a thousand square feet. And I can e-mail you more specific information if you wish.

MR. CHING: I think I understand your point
to be that if you compute the dues at 635 units and at 410, that there's proportionally less.

    MR. SALINAS: Yes, sir.
    MR. CHING: Your assumption is that the operational costs for the building is similar. Therefore you'd be short the difference between --

    THE WITNESS: 37 percent difference.
    MR. CHING: Approximately. I just wanted to hear your response. But it's not that you've -- have you researched -- do you know that this developer has actually produced very similar buildings elsewhere?

    MR. SALINAS: I'm aware. So I looked at 1133 Waimanu. The justification for the dues in Tower B where they compared it against 1133 Waimanu and 215 King, these are other developments that this developer provided in the past.

    What I found that the number they compared to for 1133 Waimanu was actually incorrect in their permit. The listed fee in their permit, and I can pull it up -- I don't want to do it. I don't have it on the computer right here. I had it on my computer. It's about 25 to 30 percent less the actual fee than the one that was listed in their permit for Waimanu.

    For North King it was about 10 percent
less. So the developer uses a comparable market analysis; compares their units in this new building to the existing units but they're using the wrong figure for those existing units.

So that's not legitimate if you actually go in and you can verify that with a simple real estate search, see what the units listed on the market. They have to list their association dues in there.

MR. CHING: Did you, when you looked at your -- did you analysis, did you note a stark difference in the amenities of the various projects? Or were they similar?

THE WITNESS: So, yes. The amenities are spartan either way. So there's no pool. There's no real recreation space to talk about. So there's very little -- it's obvious that they've cut costs here to literally stuff all those people in all that structure into such a small area. They necessarily had to, had to pretty much pave over green areas really to even get the people in and out of there with their cars. But what I noticed --

MR. CHING: Mr. Salinas, again, the question was: Are the amenities at each site relatively equivalent?
MR. SALINAS: So define "amenities".

MR. CHING: They're spartan.

MR. SALINAS: If you include some of the inputs into an association fee like water service, sewer service and basic cable, which usually gets negotiated for a building group rate, and I suspect perhaps the developer hasn't included those types of fees into their listed association dues.

I think that those qualify as amenities because it's a group benefit that you get by purchasing services from the cable company, or from the city as a group rate. So, like I said, I don't believe that the dues that they provided are defensible. I think we have a pretty strong case that they're not.

MR. CHING: I think your testimony was that in your analysis you note the difference of 10 to 25 percent, correct, at the other similar condominiums?

MR. SALINAS: I've noticed errors of 10 to 25 percent.

MR. CHING: 10 to 25 percent. So they're low, 10 to 25 percent.

MR. SALINAS: If you just do a static 2-bedroom versus 2-bedroom. If you quantify, if you
scale for the actual unit size, the unit sizes in 801 South Tower B are about 20 percent larger than the unit sizes across the board in 1133 Waimanu.

So typically -- not all the time -- 'cause apples-to-oranges now, your operational costs will scale with your unit size. You have a larger share of whatever the total cost is.

So if you actually do that scaling the dues that I calculated are about 570 a month for a 2-bedroom. If you correct that initial error and then if you scale it by square footage it's apples-to-oranges up there. I think my most apples-to-apples point is comparing the Tower A versus Tower B.

So the point remains that I fully believe that they are understating their association dues to make their affordability calculations look better.

I believe the HCDA should have the wherewithal to challenge then and ask them to substantiate, to provide an accounting. (baby crying) Respectfully. That was just one of a series of cascading underestimates and assumptions.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Okay. I don't have other questions.

THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you for your
questions. Who's up next?

MR. CHING: I think next I have Sonny Gay.

THE WITNESS: Mr. Gay. Good morning and aloha. My name is Sonny Gay. I'm a historian, personal history genealogy. I have a professional certificate from Brigham Young University in Provo. I believe I am the only one in the state that has that credential. I've been doing this type of work for over 60 years. I also worked for the Los Angeles Title -- Los Angeles Trust and Title Company in California.

And I'm very interested in the iwi, if there's iwi there. I've been searching the records daily, the land court records and the Mahele records. And I've discovered some interesting things. I'm here to request that a cultural specialist be appointed before any decision is made. Kindest aloha.

MR. CHING: Mr. Gay?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

MR. CHING: Can I ask you a few questions? You indicated that you've done research and you raise the question that is there kupuna iwi present. Do you have indications that there are?

THE WITNESS: Highly probable but they are.
As an example on one of the pieces of property there the original deed went to a man by the name of Ihu. I believe that Ihu was a chief because that area there is an ili. You had two types of ili. Ili kupuna and an ili ahupua'a. One was a direct grant from the chief. Another was a direct grant from the chief -- I mean the king. So if it's an ili it's nobility.

And the other side of the property was Kawaiaha'o. What I found that there was a grant made to the Kawaiaha'o Church under the Mahele. And that property maybe could have been part of that original grant. I'm not sure yet. But the thing is I would like to have that specialist so I could discuss these things with him and clear this up. Because the oldest cemetery in Hawai'i, public cemetery, is O'ahu Cemetery.

MR. CHING: In Nu'uanu?

THE WITNESS: Nu'uanu. That's the oldest. That was created because of demand for people to be buried. So where are these people buried, my ancestors? You see, I grew up in an all Hawaiian community. And there's a cultural belief about the iwi. As an example when why tutu was dying I said, "Tutu, you going make." She said, "Tutu no make because tutu lives with you forever because tutu is
within you."

So I'm very concerned about this. I'm one of the -- I'm 80 years old -- I'm one of the few Hawaiians that can say I grew up in an Hawaiian community where the language was spoken.

MR. CHING: Mr. Gay, if you'll indulge me. You point O'ahu Cemetery is the oldest.

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's what I believe.

MR. CHING: So is it your point that you suspect that there might be pre-O'ahu Cemetery sites?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CHING: That would be at this particular location?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm in the process of searching all the cemeteries because in the Land Court records it gives the genealogy. As an example, on the building the property went to Kamake'e. And Kamake'e was a Mrs. Pi'ikoi. I believe the delegate to congress Jonah Kalanianaole, his name was Pi'ikoi. Then she was a Kamakau. So these are historical names, people that lived, once lived.

I don't believe that people die. I mean you know, you see that slogan you know, "gone but not forgotten". I don't believe they're gone. They're not gone and they're not forgotten. They're
here and I wanna show respect for these people. Most of all I would like to have this specialist so I can discuss this with him and clear these things up. Thank you.

MR. CHING: So the specialist that you referred to is a specialist that would be assigned to and a member of the Kaka'ako Authority.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CHING: Are you aware that it's a requirement regardless of whether or not we have a seated cultural specialist, that DLNR has a review responsibility for projects such as this?

THE WITNESS: No, I'm not aware of that.

MR. CHING: Just please be assured that it doesn't just stop with a cultural specialist that serves on the Kaka'ako Authority, but rather that it is a state law that projects such as this, the specifics be allowed to be reviewed very carefully by the Department of Land and Natural Resources which contains the State Historic Preservation Division amongst others. And they have a responsibility and a process and rules which they're obliged to conduct.

THE WITNESS: Okay. And is there anybody in there that I could speak to if I wanted to?

MR. CHING: I believe the head of the
archaeology section is -- her name is Susan Lebo, L-E-B-O. So again we do have a statutory requirement to review regardless of whether or not we ourselves or the members of the Authority have expertise in a particular area. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

MR. CHING: So next would it be Ron Okamura?

THE WITNESS: Good morning. Intuitively when I look at this picture --

MR. CHING: Could you state your name for the record?

THE WITNESS: Ron Okamura, a Kaka'ako resident. Intuitively when I look at this picture, the pullout section gives me some concern because it's similar to size of where we live now at the 876 Curtis Street. Already for a approximately 200 residential unit we have, like, a backup. And it's off a side street.

This pullout is on a major thoroughfare of similar size. And it's servicing residents in excess of 800 plus. So intuitively I think there might be some traffic problems. To date there's been no traffic analysis provided, at least to the community.
On November 1st during an evening news telecast the developer's representative Ryan Harada, indicated that a traffic study was underway. We hope that it's presented to the public for at least some kind of feedback before you, the HCDA, makes a decision.

To date the only traffic access analysis has been shared to the public. And yesterday I believe a civil engineer by the name of John Caywood sent in an email testimony that points that out an error on the analysis has been made.

According to his letter to HCDA, the analysis gives rise to 128 exits at peak morning hours. The Institute of Transportation Engineering that the study references, only relates to or only seeks its validity from determining exits and entries from office building parking structures.

Again, I'm not an expert. I'm just kinda relying on the civil engineer that's produced some testimony to HCDA. I wanted to reiterate what he had said to you.

The rest of the building's all residential. So in Phase 2, 700+ cars will be coming out of that structure. And there's no analysis on the exit and entries from the building.
as you can see from the alley that's going into Kapiolani or into Kawaiaha'o Street.

So how much will -- how much worse will this traffic become? That's part of, I think, that we have as an intuitive conclusion. Again, we don't have -- I don't have the expertise. So I'm just asking the question because we have concern. That's my testimony. Thank you very much.

MR. CHING: Mr. Okamura, can I ask you a few questions?

THE WITNESS: Sure.

MR. CHING: Can you go back to the previous. So the pullout that you referenced is that one on South Street?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CHING: So you're not referencing the driveway that goes off on Kapiolani?

THE WITNESS: We have issues with that, but that's not part of my testimony.

MR. CHING: So I just want to make sure I'm abundantly clear about your point. Is the error in the analysis that you point out that the threshold and estimate of number of cars at 128 as a threshold, that it's linked to a commercial value and standard versus a residential standard?
THE WITNESS: That's my understanding.

MR. CHING: And that's the error that you
would point out?

THE WITNESS: That the civil engineer that
sent in their e-mail testimony has pointed out. I'm
just reiterating what he said. Again, I'm not an
expert on that.

MR. CHING: Just to understand. Looking at
that slide would you say that the pull-out is intended
to service the projects and that we should expect --
or what do you think the purpose of that pullout is?
Is it egress-egress?

THE WITNESS: I think it's a dropoff point.
The major beneficiary to that pullout is Tower A.
Although it's part of Tower B there's no visible walk
through for people that are dropped off at that
pullout to enter Tower B.

MR. CHING: Okay. So you would agree that
that pullout is not the major ingress-egress for
either towers and that you seem to say that it would
be a dropoff point primarily benefiting Tower A.

THE WITNESS: That's my intuitive.

MR. CHING: And that with respect to the
major -- and one of your other point on the pullout is
that there's no other alternatives to that pullout.
It's one in/one out.

THE WITNESS: One way street, yes. Well, like Muriel said, it's undersized. It's similar to our pullout which only services 200 units.

MR. CHING: Okay. So similar to your guys' pullout. What is the purpose of your pullout at Royal Capital Plaza?

THE WITNESS: Drop off.

MR. CHING: Drop off. It's similar.

THE WITNESS: Similar.

MR. CHING: Again it's not an ingress-egress point but a drop off. And it's similarly sized.

Okay. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CHING: Next we have Louise Black.

THE WITNESS: (PowerPoint) Thank you. Louise Black. This slide has the most recent information from city (sic) of Environmental Services. They have had meetings during the recent week regarding resolution 13-267. Also at these meetings were the director was of the Department of Design and Construction, another city department.

We learned from director of ENV that when they say "conditional approval" they actually mean not enough information to make a determination. So
it's not like a real approval. It should, perhaps, be conditional disapproval.

Also most of urban Honolulu sewage flows under Kaka'ako to the Ala Moana pumping station at the rate of 40 million gallons daily. The cause of the increasing odors in Kaka'ako is still unknown.

Many of the original old and small sewer lines in Central Kaka'ako and near Ward Avenue are in deteriorating conditions. And if you look at the ENV map there are also small, old sewer lines between King and Kapiolani and Ala Moana Boulevard. These are probably in the same, deteriorating condition. They're about a hundred years old.

The fourth item here should be pushed up to the left. It's our contention that pending projects should not be approved when conditional approval is not really approval and the odors problem is getting worse. We need to make sure we look out the health and welfare of the community.

Thank you.

MR. CHING: Can I ask you a few questions?
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. CHING: So when you spoke to an employee of the City Department of Environmental Services, and that the one that told you that conditional approval
is not enough information to make a determination, did you mention to him, well, your point that "it's really not an approval then?"

THE WITNESS: I didn't speak directly. But one of the members of Imperial Plaza who was at the meeting spoke to Director Kalakina asking what 'conditional approval' actually meant. It was her reply that it means "not enough information to make a determination".

MR. CHING: And that was a quote from the director.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CHING: This is just a question. When somebody says "conditional approval" to you, your impression would be that subject to conditions it's approved. Would that be accurate?

THE WITNESS: That would be what I would think. So I was really surprised when I heard that. It really means "not enough information to make a determination."

MR. CHING: Okay. The point would be that typically 'conditional approval' as you'll see in many instances, does mean that at this point you're approved but I still need the final information and your final buildout. So that's why it's conditional.
But 'conditional' and 'approval' says conditionally you're all right at this point. Although that can change if the information comes in and is different from what's provided.

THE WITNESS: But then the question would be when does that information come in? Does it come in before HCDA does the final approval?

MR. CHING: Just for general information: So the process typically is Zoning is the first step. And Zoning says: Okay. You're all right in general, land use and density and otherwise to proceed.

But then there's other steps to finish. You have subdivision requirements to be met, if there are, and ultimately building permit and code requirements that you only see when the Project is actually constructed.

Then the Final when a building is rendered "okay, you're all right fully" is when a Certificate of Occupancy is given. That said, that at this point you've been built but before you can move in "we have to check to be sure everything was set and you have all your approvals." That's just an information.

THE WITNESS: I think that once the building is built then can you go in and say, "I'm sorry but we
can't approve"?

MR. CHING: Actually that is the purpose of the Certificate of Occupancy. You must have a Certificate of Occupancy which is the stamp, the final approval. So if a developer is at peril, that if they do not perform according to the conditions that are specified, that they risk not receiving a Certificate of Occupancy. Just general information.

THE WITNESS: But this would be after the building's built?

MR. CHING: Yes. But cannot be occupied unless that certificate is given.

THE WITNESS: Right. But it's kind of like we're going backwards then. They should have enough information to make the determination before the building's built.

MR. CHING: And I guess that's why they call it conditional approval.

THE WITNESS: Once it's built it's there for a hundred years.

MR. CHING: Possibly, yes. Okay. Thank you. Next we have Grace Ishihara.

THE WITNESS: Aloha. My name is Grace Ishihara. I'm a resident of Kaka'ako. I would like to point out a few things about the infrastructure
about the schools. There's insufficient public school
capacity for Kaka'ako developments. And as of the
2013 school year there's no more additional room for
elementary students at Royal or Queen Ka'ahumanu
Elementary Schools.

And based on DOE they have asked HCDA to
consider public school capacity for Kaka'ako
students. And they have also engaged in a dialogue
to address the overarching issues.

I would like to point out that the state
site average for elementary schools is 8.75 acres.
And of the 175 elementary schools on O'ahu Royal is
the fourth smallest at 2.89. Ka'ahumanu is the
twelfth smallest at 4.07 acres. Apparently there's
no room for additional portable classrooms for
additional students.

And the Pohukaina property is an egregious
example of one of HCDA's disregard for public school
requirements in Kaka'ako District. It is the only
state-owned parcel considered as a possible place
for a school.

However, instead HCDA permitted
development for 690 Pohukaina on that parcel which
increases school -- with the increasing demand for
schools, but eliminating the only viable location
for one on that state-owned parcel. I believe that the Kaka'ako residents have the same need for a quality public education as the residents everywhere in the state of Hawai'i. Thank you.

MR. CHING: May I ask you a few questions? Would you -- you indicate that in terms of average sizes for schools -- or you did indicate that there are discussions underway with the Department of Education as to what direction they would take with respect to schools.

THE WITNESS: According to my source that works at DOE. I have no affiliation with DOE.

MR. CHING: Sure. But you did mention that you acknowledged discussions. You acknowledge or you state that a statewide average for elementary school sites is 8.75 acres.

THE WITNESS: Hmm-mmm, yes, correct.

MR. CHING: And with the smallest, Royal being the smallest at 2.89?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CHING: So if we were to take the smallest 2.89 acres for an elementary school, where would you think that school might be located in Kaka'ako? (baby crying) Well, first what agency do you believe is the sole arbiter of school policy? Who
makes school policy?

THE WITNESS: The Department of Education.

MR. CHING: So their challenge, you seem to indicate, is that there's no space at Royal or Queen K, that another school should be developed. And the size of a school is at minimum the Royal, which is the smallest at 2.89, that it would be incumbent upon them to come up with a plan if the average is 8.75. They're gonna figure out how to fit, right? They should wanna fit, right?

THE WITNESS: Hmm-hmm, yes.

MR. CHING: So they're the ones that understand where there's a need. They're the ones that would understand where to put a school. And it's not HCDA. Would you agree to that?

THE WITNESS: Yes. But haven't they approached HCDA to negotiate a place for another public school in the community?

MR. CHING: Actually there have been discussions. And really there's a couple mechanisms. One, there's a statutory. So state law that says that DOE has the Authority to establish school impact fee districts. And that once they establish it and they present their analysis as to what they want to do, they can levy -- they don't have to establish rules --
they can levy a requirement that X amount or the
school be developed by fees being collected and that
would be a matter of law.

So in that particular case I guess my
point is that the DOE has that power, that
authority, to make decisions regarding the
directions of schools.

And we're obliged, any agency because it's
state law, would be obliged to follow what they say.
So, yes, we're trying to figure out what they want
to say and what direction they would like in this
particular area because we acknowledge that's not
our area of expertise. And it would be, you would
acknowledge, that it's difficult to find a 2+ acre
site.

THE WITNESS: Yes. In our district it is.

MR. CHING: But your testimony is that
Pohukaina School, the former site, which happens to be
3.3 acres, and it's left with 95,000 square feet. So
that's just about 2 acres left after the completion of
an affordable rental facility for 204 residents or
units for sale.

So we can agree, certainly, that it would
be challenging to find a school site. And that
necessarily any school site anywhere would draw not
just from Kaka'ako. It would draw from the available population, right?

(Witness nods head.)

MR. CHING: So this is a challenge that we face in terms of siting schools. And that the DOE is our leader in terms of where and how that happens. They have a tool to say, "Developers, you must pay money impact fee, or donate land," as the case may be. That's a fact. I just want for us to agree that HCDA isn't going to be making those policies. They will be driven by DOE.

THE WITNESS: (Nodding).

MR. CHING: Thank you. Next we have Cara Kimura or Eva Gallegos or both.

THE WITNESS: Good morning. I'm Cara Kimura. We acknowledge there's a lack of available public land, kind of tying onto that school thing. The Mauka Area plan wisely acknowledged that Kaka'ako needs about 60 acres of park space for the anticipated population. And in tandem with this their Mauka Area Rules require the private developers to satisfy part of this need.

For Tower B about 23,000 square feet of recreational space is required, proposed as we have shown. But -- and we've pointed this out before in
our first public hearing, meeting room 1 is the
ground floor lobby.

And I know you mentioned that you live in
a single-family home. Maybe you or others are not
familiar with how condo living is. Your lobby is
one of the most busiest places in the building.
There's a lot of in and out, hustle and bustle. So
although you said it qualifies as a recreational
space, we would like clarification as to how it
qualifies.

By the definitions in the Mauka Area
Rules, a 'recreation space' means someplace that's
available for recreational use. If you have this
lobby that's full of hustle and bustle and in and
out, what kind of recreational activities can really
go on here? That's sort of what our question is,
particularly for children.

Also the open areas do qualify as part of
recreational space requirement. But the ones that
are provided on the existing plan are these little
narrow strips of green space that are all adjacent
to vehicular pathways.

We really want to ask is this really safe
for recreational activities? And don't Kaka'ako
families deserve a safe recreational area
particularly an area that's, you know, large enough to have meaningful recreational spaces?

So if you look at what is really available for meaningful recreation that only leaves us with meeting Room 2, which is about 5,000 square feet and roughly 20 percent of the minimum required space.

Kaka'ako families are no different from any other families and deserve the same safe and meaningful recreational areas.

Next we come to the driveway you had referenced earlier in our traffic discussion. The developers are seeking a modification in order to place a driveway to their vehicular alley 6 feet from the adjoining property line, the Lexus Dealership site. Now, this modification presents an eminent pedestrian hazard.

We've all already experienced that even at the existing driveway to the Advertiser lot, which is farther away, we've had near misses because of the height of the surrounding hedges which are only about 4 feet and the inattention of drivers.

The fact of the matter is that drivers exiting onto Kapiolani are just more focused about merging into busy traffic than looking at pedestrians.
This is an illustration of the area where the proposed location for that driveway is on. As you can see that corner of that Lexus Building just blocks off any kind of view of the pedestrian and the driver.

And, you know, I walk around Downtown Honolulu. I know you've proposed putting a flashing light there. But if you walked around downtown enough you know that drivers don't pay attention to flashing lights or beeping sounds, and neither do pedestrians.

You know, it's a well-known saying or maybe not so well-known but at Pearl Harbor anyway: "Accidents don't just happen. They are caused."
The developer is creating a cause for an accident.

(buzzer) Thank you.

THE WITNESS: (Ms. Gallegos) HCDA is making decisions that will impact the sustainability --

MR. CHING: Excuse me. Can you introduce yourself.

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Eva Gallegos. HCDA is making decisions that will impact the sustainability of Kaka'ako. HCDA must be held accountable for those decisions because the community's interests, best interest, is clearly being
put at risk. HCDA must deny the development permit for Tower B. That is my testimony.

MR. CHING: And I'll ask you a question. Ms. Gallegos, can you summarize, then, why you believe that from a sustainability standpoint the Project Applicant doesn't meet its test?

THE WITNESS: There are many concerns that we have as a community, and from my standpoint as a person who's more focused on the health of individuals. There's a laundry list of questions that we have that will impact our well-being and our health in this area.

But, again, it's really our, the residents in the area, but also anybody who comes to Kaka'ako, the safety, our safety's at risk with the increased traffic. The lack of schools for both middle school and high school, the traffic congestion, the access to emergency services, although the Queen's Hospital is in walking distance to Kaka'ako area.

The hospital itself is, only can accommodate so many people. I've witnessed that firsthand.

The sewer capability, the access to nearby groceries, the electrical capability, the lack of child care services, the sidewalks are not -- some
areas are not even walkable. We question whether or not the police and fire departments and other public services will have access to us based on the traffic congestion.

Our well-being: There are open spaces but these open spaces are limited. And how available will they be when there are thousands of more people added to that area? We see that the planning is in a, is being done in a fragmented approach where one area needs to decide, like HCDA needs to wait until the city has input on it. The city has to wait until Department of Education has input on it.

I was very aware, very much aware of what happened about the traffic study when the planner spoke with us and was pretty much set on not doing a traffic study. Maybe a few weeks later he changed his mind but that was after the fact. So some of these decisions need to be made prior to a development being done.

MR. CHING: Is it your understanding that a traffic study is being done or is not being done?

THE WITNESS: Well, based on the news we understood that it was going to be done. But it was done -- it was -- a decision was made after we had asked for one to be done. But we were told that it
was not going to be.

So we need more honest dialogue and maybe not such a fragmented dialogue with the developers and HCDA and anyone else who's involved with, you know, creating this Project in this area.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Ms. Kimura?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CHING: I happen to live in a single-family dwelling. I have five kids. Our popular way for recreation is that we move the cars and we shoot baskets in our driveway because we have a small yard. So that's how we do recreation.

If they need a bigger space we typically go down the street and we find an available public park and they'll shoot a round or they'll go play football or the like.

THE WITNESS: So you're proposing that --

MR. CHING: No, just a statement. Just a statement. You say, and I certainly agree, I don't live in a condo. How do you achieve your recreation? How do you meet your recreational needs?

THE WITNESS: Well, we have -- we are lucky enough to have a recreational area, open space. It's called a rec deck. It also has a pool. I don't typically use the pool, but, you know, we do have an
area to sit out, cook if you want to. There's a
little barbecue area. I might like to also mention
it's going to be closer to the 801 South Street Tower
B than my unit is, and just to congregate.

My nephew likes to run around in the rec
deck area. It's large enough that he can do that
safely. It's not adjacent to any vehicular pathways
but he can run around. He can't do that in the
lobby. He'd run into somebody or probably cause
them to drop something. He might also open the door
and run out into traffic. So the rec deck area is a
good place for him to play.

MR. CHING: So if not at the rec deck how
would your recreational needs be met?

THE WITNESS: We also have a board room. I
know 801 South Street is also providing a board room.
But it's another place where, yeah, we have birthday
parties.

MR. CHING: So your testimony is that your
recreational needs would be largely met at your
condominium and the rec deck and available board room.
You didn't mention going offsite to a park or anything
else, but if it's needed you would.

THE WITNESS: It's just me though. I'm not
an outdoor person. But what I'm submitting is that
for Tower B you do have a requirement for a minimum amount of space. And one of them happens to be a lobby. So I just -- I'd like clarification on how that functions as a recreational area. Then you've counted the open space as rec area, but as I've noted it's all adjacent to vehicle access. So is that very safe for recreation?

MR. CHING: Just as a point of clarification. The rules that say that, that define what rec space is is uniform for all condos, projects in Kaka'ako uniformly. And that uniformly we ask for each project that they describe or that they have at least 55 square feet of rec deck, a rec space. I'm sorry.

And that rec space could include a rec deck in combination that's at aboveground, open space at grade, it includes lobby areas and the like. It includes even the notion -- I don't think it includes lanais, but again there is a definition that is uniformly applied.

So would you expect that your project also has a similar computation? Open space would be counted at the lobby and at the green areas downstairs that are not driveways?

THE WITNESS: I would expect that.
MR. CHING: But notwithstanding that, you do not use it. You're saying you wouldn't expect people to use it if it presents harm or possibilities. They would typically gravitate in terms of use of recreation space to a rec deck.

THE WITNESS: Could you repeat that? I don't understand what you're asking.

MR. CHING: If all projects compute open space and recreation space and the rules apply to all.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CHING: And then so your lobby, your open space, wherever it is at grade, as well as elevated, the rec deck is computed, is all computed typically? Would you agree to that?

THE WITNESS: I haven't done the computation personally so I can't agree or disagree. But --

MR. CHING: Okay. Let's just say that the rules apply to all.

MR. SALINAS: Is this the wrong rule then?

MR. CHING: No. I'm saying that the rule that defines what rec space is applies to all condominiums.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

MR. CHING: Because that rule doesn't just say, "For 801 South." It says, "For Kaka'ako."
THE WITNESS: Yeah. But our building was built in 1989. And from my understanding the rules have changed significantly between that time and 2011 I believe was the last modification to your rules.

MR. CHING: Sure. But during the 1989 we had very similar rules and we can go look at them. I'm just asking that you accept as a general principle that rules regarding the definition and the provision of rec space and definition of open space, that it would apply to all within the district.

THE WITNESS: I would hope so.

MR. CHING: So you're accepting that it should apply. And then the next thing is that from a practical standpoint, notwithstanding the definition of open space and rec space.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

MR. CHING: That you would gravitate to the most -- the safest place. So that might be your rec deck or the most comfortable place where you can meet your needs. And you indicated that it could be a boardroom in your case.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CHING: And it could be the rec deck.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CHING: And if you chose to it could
also be offsite.

THE WITNESS: It could be.

MR. CHING: That's my question. I just wanted us to understand. Thank you.

MR. SALINAS: Thank you very much.

MR. CHING: Next we have Mary Caywood.

MR. SALINAS: So are we limited to 3 minutes or not?

MR. CHING: Everyone is limited to 3 minutes. If I choose to ask questions to get clarification, then the 3-minute time doesn't count.

Holly, I think I need to give you a break.

(Recess was held. 11:15-11:25)

MR. CHING: Okay. Let's get started.

Holly, are you good to go? If we could come to order.

So now we have Ms. Caywood. Would you introduce yourself and you have 3 minutes.

THE WITNESS: I'm Mary Caywood. I'm an owner at Royal Capital Plaza but I don't live here.

My units are facing Diamond Head so the new building is not in my viewpoint. I'm just interested in the entire community. Mr. Ching, thank you for giving us additional time for these herrings.

On HCDA's website for Phase 2 the only entry for traffic is a memorandum dated July 18th,
2013 from the traffic management consultant to Downtown Capital. That's the company asking for this.

Most of the memorandum that the developer submitted concerns improvements to Kawaiaha'o and Emily Streets for traffic entering and leaving Phase 1.

In the access analysis section the only comment on Kapiolani says: "The access driveway on Kapiolani Boulevard is expected to operate at Level of Service A during the AM and PM peak hours of traffic. There's no analysis or support for that statement."

The statement is hard to believe since a traffic analysis used by McKinley High School in a Traffic Impact Study in January 2011 said the Level of Service was C for both weekday a.m./p.m. peak hours at the Kapiolani Boulevard/South Street/King Street intersection.

In the memorandum a trip generation summary table is also hard to believe. According to the table only 175 vehicles would exit Tower A garage and 128 would exit Tower B garage during the AM peak hour of adjacent street traffic, a total of 303 vehicles going out of garages with spaces for
more than 1500 vehicles for residents.

    During the PM peak hours a total of only
247 would enter the two garages. That sounds more
like retirees coming and going in the middle of
winter on the mainland than young workforce people
in Hawai'i.

    Or perhaps that we don't know the
demographics represented by this report, but it is
not appropriate for Hawai'i. It could be a dense
urban area with few parking spaces for highrises.
And the memorandum emphasis may be on Kawaiaha'o
since it will be difficult to enter and exist
Kapiolani so near the South Street intersection.

    We think traffic problems will start
before drivers try to go out of either parking
garage. With cars waiting to enter Kapiolani the
driveway will be backed up and gridlock could extend
to the top floor of the garage. (buzzer)

    We hope the developer plans to have plenty
of fans in the Phase 1 garage to blow away exhaust
fumes when the tradewinds aren't blowing. And then
a Phase 2 garage is never built.

    HCDA should require that the developer
submit an acceptable traffic analysis before a
development project is even considered. This has
not been done for Phase 2.

Then I wanted to say, HCDA please don't lose your vision for Kaka'ako that you've been developing for 30 years. The cost is too much, the price too high to approve any modifications that lessen the already low standards you set for workforce housing.

There's always going to be a need for moderate and low cost housing. Just because the developer waves the workforce housing flag and asks for unsupportable modifications, does not mean that they will solve the need for housing. I could go on and on, but thank you.

MR. CHING: Thank you for summarizing. And we have you written comments. I do note your points with respect to the adequacy of the TIAR. Thank you. That's it for the people who have signed up for 801 South that I have today. Is there any other person who desires to provide testimony on 801 South Street?

Yes, ma'am. Please step forward. If you would state your name any organization that you might represent. And if I could ask that before you leave you fill out one of these registration forms because we keep a record.

THE WITNESS: Hi. My name is Daci Armstrong.
I live at 626 Coral Street in Pohulani, a low income retiree building. I joined forces sort of with the RCP people because I can remember not too long ago when I had any kids and there was a place for them to play.

And, Mr. Ching, you're very lucky to have a driveway and maybe space down your block where you can send kids to. But if this building and development goes through the way it's planned with no outdoor play space, I can just imagine there's going to be a lot of mothers looking for mental health help. (laughter) And I would be one of 'em. You know the little current climbers get on your nerves. You've got to have someplace to send 'em.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right.

THE WITNESS: Do you want to send them down -- "Go down and play in the lobby"? Oh...come.... on. That's absurd! That the first place people see when they come into your building and it's going to full of any kids? Gee, what an impression. That's about it.

(sighing)

MR. CHING: Ma'am?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CHING: So I take it you oppose the --

MR. CHING: Thank you. Anyone else to testify on 801 South? Please step forward.

THE WITNESS: My name is Pamela Wood. I live in the Imperial Plaza. And I'm against this Project. And I hate speaking publically, and you guys know it. I am -- when -- I'm really concerned about the workforce housing. I think the community has been concerned about it from the beginning. (baby crying)

We all support the concept. However, the more we've learned about the 2 pages that were added to the reserve housing law which is titled "workforce housing" we have now come to understand that this is -- it's just a license to double density ask for any change to the Mauka Area Rules. And we have no assurance as a community.

And what I have learned is until the building is completed and you are trying to issue a Certificate of Occupancy, that's when you can tell the community that by us supporting doubling the density, that we have -- we have provided to the target group the benefit that we as a community are giving up.

We're giving up our space. We're giving up our rights, our values, our beliefs, our understandings. And we're giving it to these...
people. But in the end it may not be even the
people that we think we're giving it to.

I know this because I called in to Marcus
and Associates in July. And I asked if I could
purchase one of these units. You see up until that
time we as a community believed that 'workforce
housing' was going to be 75 percent of that hundred
to 140 percent of the median income.

What we found out subsequently is that's
only for 60 days. And when they talk about
workforce housing they talk about workforce-priced
housing. You see? So it's the price and the size
that creates it to be workforce housing because
really it's only for 60 days that it is being
offered to this workforce and the owner occupant.
But that owner occupant is really tied to the condo
law, not to the workforce housing. So people use
all these terms. And until we started learning more
about things -- and, Tony, there is -- I'm sorry.

There is a way that you can find out who
is on that buyer's list. And are we really right
now in escrow? Are we meeting what the public
believes we are meeting in the workforce housing and
serving that population?

Because I know from my experience. I was
licensed as a broker in 1976 and I've done project
development and general brokerage sales. I've
managed. I've done marketing and I've worked in
development. (buzzer)

You can find out. We used to have to sell
these projects three times over knowing that in 2
and-a-half years people were gonna fall out of
escrow. We can get a reading who we're targeting
before the community is being asked again to give up
this open space, this beautiful Kaka'ako that we
thought we were buying into. And we do support
workforce housing. Just let's do it right. Thank
you.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Anybody else for 801
South? (sic) Hearing no one else for 801 South I'm
going to shift to our next development action
KAK13-091, 801 Waimanu. I have a bunch of people who
have signed up. May I ask is there a Julia Dyer? If
you come up you have 3 minutes.

THE WITNESS: Just a correction. I think
it's 803.

MR. CHING: I'm sorry. Did I say that?
It's 803 Waimanu.

THE WITNESS: So I'm actually --

MR. CHING: Could you identify yourself.
THE WITNESS: My name is Julia Dyer.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Please proceed.

THE WITNESS: I'm a resident here. I grew up here. I went away for college but I moved back when I was 25 years old. Basically I'm in support of developing Kaka'ako. I feel that the area simply needs more housing.

In terms of the recreational issues my view point is that Hawai'i it's in and of itself a recreational destination. It's warm all year 'round. There are a number of different places to go out of doors. But the shortage lies in the housing. People need housing.

When I -- just this past year I've been able to come see this direct area and how it has been revitalized. And I'm incredibly impressed with how the arts have come into this area. I got a chance to go see the night market in this area which I was incredibly impressed.

I didn't know this was all going on. In my opinion a way to further the revitalization of the area is to provide housing for the people, for people who wannabe here.

Honolulu's population is growing. And there's a shortage of housing. It's my
understanding that with this development that we're talking about now has been already modified in several ways to appease the people already in the area. It's my understanding that the size has been reduced, the directions, things like that.

I think the people who are interested in housing in this area are just interested in making the area better.

One of the things about being an urban setting is, I think, is safety is something that people are concerned about, I think bringing in new residents where people are actually living in the area I think will improve that.

I think that there's people who wanna take advantage of everything that's going on in this area. And there are people who wanna be closer to it. I think that the people living in this area, more people living in this area would help that.

And in terms of recreational space: When I was living on the mainland one of the places I lived where I moved to back to Honolulu from was New York City. So I completely understand that space is a commodity.

But I have seen people (buzzer) work in New York, not that Honolulu will ever turn into what
New York is, but I’ve seen people, you know, work with the space that they have and make it a beautiful, beautiful thing. I think that Hawai‘i is for everybody.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Just for clarification. For the permit for the application at the hand KAK 13-091, 803 Waimanu, do you support, oppose or just provide comments?

THE WITNESS: Support.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Next we have Cheree Smith. Good morning.

THE WITNESS: Good morning. My name is Cheree Smith. I am here to support 803 Waimanu. I have been living in Hawai‘i since I started college. The idea of workforce affordable housing is something that I think is really important that Hawai‘i lacks in. If it did I would definitely be owning a place right now that I lived in.

So I think Kaka‘ako, the area, as well as had a face lift. It's definitely a place to go to now. In the past it wasn't. You wouldn't come down here or hang around in this part of Honolulu.

I think that it is important to keep it going and bring in housing for the people who work here and who live here and for it to be affordable.
So, yeah, I just wanted to take time out of my day today to come and just let everybody know that I'm in support of that.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Next we have Cindy Mahoney.

THE WITNESS: Hi. I'm Cindy Mahoney. I'm in support of 803 Waimanu too. I have 2 children that live here. One lives way in the back of Hawai'i Kai. The other one lives in Wahiawa. And both my daughter and her husband that live in Hawai'i Kai work in town. And my other daughter works at the airport.

And they spend so much time on the road driving and then the cost of gas too, takes up a large part of their earings. They would love to live down closer to where they work. Of course, I would love to have 'em here too because I enjoy being around them.

The other thing is that I live downtown myself. I live there because it's convenient to work. It's convenient to a lot of other things that are going on. And I'm sure that that's one of the reasons that the people who are opposing 803 -- I'm not positive, but I'm pretty sure, I have an idea that they probably moved in this area for convenience of work and things to do.
And I think that other people ought to have that opportunity too. There aren't a whole lot of other places where people do work that are going to be -- where else can we grow? Waikiki is taken up. Downtown's pretty much taken up. Many other places are getting really dense too. And it's going to happen. I mean I don't know how you could -- we live on an island. Where else are you gonna go?

So I'm hoping that my children will have an opportunity to move in and enjoy living close to where they work, spend time with families eventually and enjoy what downtown has to offer and Kaka'ako has to offer now. Thank you.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Next we have Steven Lam. Oh, I'm sorry. For 803 Waimanu Justin Powers.

THE WITNESS: Hi. My name is Justin Powers. I'm in support of 803 Waimanu. Originally it was my understanding that 803 Waimanu was going to be developed for workforce housing. And it was gonna give an opportunity for my wife and I to be able to actually own a place and be part of this community.

And because there were so much opposition we were denied that opportunity. I know that there was some things that were wrong with the sort of mandates that the building was too high or certain
things were not in, like, code I guess.

Then I think that they came back with a new sort of idea for development. And it's still being opposed. I don't know if there's always going to be opposition no matter what. Or if once we finally, we finally meet all the terms and what's asked of the development, if they'll actually be given that opportunity to actually start building and will be given that opportunity to actually own a piece of that property.

Me and my wife have both grown up here our whole lives, and would like nothing more than to have the ability to be a part of the community. And I don't think it's too much to ask. That's it.

MR. CHING: Mr. Powers, would you -- because there was some question as to whether the developer would rent or sell, would you be renting or sell?

THE WITNESS: Renting or owning?

MR. CHING: Yes.

THE WITNESS: We'd like to own.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Mr. Lam.

THE WITNESS: Sure. Good morning, Mr. Ching. My name is Steven Lam. I spoke with you earlier today. I am speaking on behalf of both
properties 801 South Street, and 803 Waimanu Street.
But since I'm here with opportunity I'm going to go
ahead right now.

I'm speaking primarily on road structures.
As an consumer I drive around. I have a Honda 2013
Civic. And I noticed that the transitions of road
structures both on public property and on private
property transitions from lanes is very dynamic.
It's very difficult.

I really feel that the Department of
Transportation should take a look at that. Not to
mention also the policies and regulations that has
to be met for other consumers to abide by rules,
policies and regulations. Thank you.

MR. CHING: Mr. Lam, do you take a position
on either of these projects for or against?

THE WITNESS: Excuse me?

MR. CHING: Do you take a position either
for or against either one of these projects or you're
just providing comments?

THE WITNESS: I've done more research on 801
South Street. I've done very little bit on 803 Waimanu
Street. I'm supporting both of them at the moment.

MR. CHING: Support.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. CHING: Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to provide comments at this time for either -- well, let's first for 803 Waimanu? Please step forward and state your name. Afterwards if you could fill out one of these.

THE WITNESS: Certainly. Good morning. My name's Eddy Johnson. I just want to speak to the folks that came here to support development at 803. I live in Imperial Plaza. Just a few notes. First, I guess for Cindy, you had mentioned about affordability and being close. I think it's your daughter that would be seeking to live there in that area. Again, I opened this up the last time.

There's a unit for sale right next to us that's completely affordable that you're more than welcome to move in. There are other vacancies in Kaka'ako that you can move to that are affordable.

In terms of safety I think your daughter brought it up, this building -- I don't know if you looked at the drawings -- okay, maybe you're not the lady -- I'm not sure. But the building is right next to where we live. There's absolutely no separation from our living spaces. So it's not going to be safe. Anybody can scale the wall, jump into our lana'i and then walk into our living room.
Also I think it was Mr. Powers, I'm not sure if you looked closer at the plans. But for you and your wife and your child to live in any of this new development I think the largest unit may be 700 square feet possibly, if that. It's very, very tight. This is a concrete sardine can that they are creating.

And you may or may not be able to get a parking space because there's not enough parking in that building for the tenants. So I encourage you please before you continue to support the development, please take a real close look at those plans and see what you would be buying into. 'Cause I'm not sure you'd wanna live there. I know I wouldn't quite honestly. So that's all I have to say.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to provide comment? Are you speaking on 803 Waimanu? You had your 3 minutes.

THE WITNESS: Yes. (Ms. Gallegos)

MR. CHING: Okay. Then you can.

THE WITNESS: Just a rebuttal. Real quick.

MR. CHING: Can you identify yourself.

THE WITNESS: My name is Eva Gallegos. The terms used that are very common is 'revitalize'. I'm
absolutely for revitalization. I lived in Chicago and I lived in the New York area. And I have experienced revitalization in those areas. However, the smart way to do it is to improve the infrastructure.

I have seen facelifts. And if you've ever seen them going bad they're pretty bad when they go bad. We don't want facelifts. We want construction, solid construction that's going to sustain Kaka'ako for the long haul beyond our years of even life for the generations to come.

Seriously. If you think that Queen's is going to be there for their emergency services when you need them, they may not be there as -- physically they'll be there but accessibility is questionable. I see it firsthand every day where people have to wait for services, pediatric children. In fact Kapiolani is now just starting a new structure to accommodate the pediatric population.

So just be very careful when you invite thousands of people to an area. Are we going to be able to take care of them? That's part of looking at building a safe and health community. It's just not building buildings. We have to look at the entire thing. Okay?
And affordability. If people really want affordability there are units available in all the high-rises that are in Kaka'ako. In fact Royal Capital Plaza has units available that are just as affordable as the incoming residences or buildings, units that are being built.

So come into our lobby. We have a list of units and they're just as affordable. You don't have to qualify. I just want to say to the supporters: Think about it. Be open to wanting to sustain and build a community that's going to be safe for your family. Thank you.

MR. CHING: Ms. Gallegos, can I ask you how much would a unit be that you speak of and what would be --

THE WITNESS: A 1-bedroom at maybe 500 square feet would be about $3- at right now market it would be somewhere between 325 and 360,000.

MR. CHING: And what would the association fees be?

THE WITNESS: Depending on square footage it would range a little bit over $300 a month.

MR. CHING: $300 a month?

THE WITNESS: Right.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Is there anyone
wishing to provide testimony?  Sorry, Pam you already
did.  (Pam Wood)

THE WITNESS:  I did on their Project not on
803.

MR. CHING:  Okay.  I'm getting confused.
(laughter)  Can I ask that you fill out the speaker
registration.

THE WITNESS:  I just wanted to make a
commented, especially to they -- oh, they left. I was
just going to say that really our concerns are
infrastructure, especially sewer and roads, sidewalks,
pedestrian safety, traffic congestion, street
landscaping, things that make a community, things that
will benefit the new buyers as well as current
residents and things that will sustain the future.

So I just wanted to make that comment.
And I -- at this point because again we don't have
enough information about the plans, there were so
many questions at that first public hearing.

And hopefully we'll through the website, I
would assume, get some of this updated information
and answers to the questions that you specifically
asked during the first presentation, because it's
not a complete project.

We don't know. We don't know exactly what
it is. So it's hard to decide how you feel exactly about it. Thank you.

MR. CHING: Anybody else for 803 Waimanu? Hearing none, then at this point I'm going to adjourn the portion where I take testimony and it's recorded by a court reporter. And I'm going to shift. Last chance for testimony. Okay. So, Holly, thank you. It is 11:52.

(The proceedings were adjourned at 11:52 a.m.)
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MR. CHING: Good evening, everyone. Anthony Ching, Executive Director HCDA. And serving as hearing officer for two dockets that we're taking testimony on today.

On June 19, the Authority authorized the Executive Director to schedule and conduct supplemental public comment sessions. Again, these are designed to augment, not replace, public hearings that are already scheduled. I note that every third Tuesday we typically have a community briefly at this time. And it's a chance for people to speak informally to staff about the upcoming agenda and items of interest.

So we're looking to supplement that briefing. So we'll be taking public comment on two development permit applications that are before the Authority at this time. So all comments received for each of the development permits will be captured by our court reporter and will be forwarded to the Authority for their review.

If you previously testified at our public hearings, those testimonies are already part of the record as will your testimony tonight. There will be no presentations by the Applicants. However, their presentations or their materials are on a
table on the back wall. They're available for your viewing. I need to ask you not to remove these materials from the room as they are intended for all to view.

So I'll be taking first comments for KAK13-057, 801 South Street, Phase 2. And that will be followed by KAK13-091, 803 Waimanu. After testimony for each project has been taken, I will dismiss our court reporter and then we can discuss informally with you present those questions that you might have for any agency activities in the format of our regular community meetings.

Our intention in doing these supplemental briefings is to allow for people to, again, make comments. Our intention as we receive your comments is we're trying to understand what's being said, what issues are foremost in your folks' minds to make sure that we include that. It's my intention to report that to the Authority.

Some of the issues in general that have been raised are -- especially for 801 South Street -- that the developer's calculations are incorrect and the units are not affordable. I should note for you that I have a meeting with Mr. Salinas on this Friday morning to go over his
That there's insufficient infrastructure to support more growth. And I think the last time I talked about where the infrastructure is in a particular area, how we get to any determinations.

That there's too much density in this particular area. And there was notions about how traffic will get worse and that the curb cut modifications along Kapiolani Boulevard might compromised pedestrian safety.

In addition, there are not enough schools in Kaka'ako and not enough park space in Kaka'ako. So these are items that I'll be reporting back on what your comments are and with our own analysis.

But certainly, you know, I wanted to demonstrate that we are hearing what your issues are. And we're fairly reporting that back to the Authority.

So at this time I'm going to start off with, again, 801 South Street. KAK13-057 and that's 801 South Street Phase 2. I have signed up to testify first Louise Black. You're together and Mary Caywood.

MR. CHING: So Louise and Mary Caywood. If you will come forward and introduce who's going to
speak first.

    MS. CAYWOOD: Okay. May voice is not too
good today but Louise will take over if I can't
finish. Of course this is objection to 801 South
Street Phase 2. In reviewing requests from developers
for permits to build workforce housing, HCDA may
consider modifications to provisions of the Mauka Area
Rules section of Hawaii Administrative Rules.

    Developers hoping to maximize their
profits, since that's what developers do, read that
statement as anything goes or at least it's worth
trying. Since workforce housing rules are new and
relatively untried there are as yet few precedent
cases to indicate to developers what modifications
might or might not be approved.

    When major modifications were approved for
801 South Street Phase 1, the developer was
encouraged to ask for modifications for Phase 2.
However, trying to squeeze a similar high density
Project onto the remaining small portion of a city
block calls for extreme major modifications.

    The developer asked for approval of a
10-story 107-foot high parking garage tower in lieu
of a 65-foot podium type of structure. According to
Mauka Area Rules a podium may be separate from the
residential tower.

Does the fact that it is a separate structure is not in question. To allow an increase in height from 65 feet to 107 feet is a 60 percent increase, an extremely high amount. Another 23 feet and the 65-foot standard would be doubled.

By definition "modification" is a partial alteration. To modify is to reduce and extend or agree to change somewhat the form or qualities of something. For residential construction we would probably think of reasonable modification as a few feet in difference or small percentage.

The fact that the land area is too small for the Project as proposed is not a valid reason for HCDA to approve a major modification in a structure that's a part of other concerns such as traffic impact on the community.

Another modification is the developer's request for a curb cut that's 6 and-a-quarter feet from the adjoining property line rather than the required 22 foot setback from adjacent properties. This curb cut connects the Phase 2 driveway to Kapiolani Boulevard and provides vehicular access to the parking structure.

On a measurement basis alone the
Modification would move the edge of the drive 72 percent of the distance closer to the property line. (time buzzer) The resulting location makes it a major hazard to pedestrians and bicyclists as cars leave the driveway and it's part of the critical traffic impact.

We hope that HCDA has a rule of thumb or line in the sand to think about in considering proposed modifications, and is willing to set a precedent. Those that -- this extreme an impact on the community should be denied. Any small gain in moderate priced housing over the number of units that could be built without major modifications is not worth the cost to the community. There must be better solutions.

HCDA should encourage developers to find more suitable locations for their projects.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Can you introduce yourself for purposes of the record?

THE WITNESS: Oh. I didn't tell you? I'm Mary Caywood. C-A-Y-W-O-O-D:

MR. CHING: Thank you. And if you stay at the table, I'm going to ask some questions for you.

Ms. Black.

MS. BLACK: To summarize: In responding to
community concerns HCDA's answer to the more difficult question is, "We need workforce housing." Of course, we do. We need it and always will need moderate and low cost housing in Hawai'i no matter what it's called.

That ongoing need does not excuse HCDA from making enlightened community responsive decisions on proposed construction projects. HCDA makes the rules and makes decisions on the rules. Phase 2 of the 801 South Street is the developer trying to squeeze a too large high-density Project into too small a space in the wrong location.

HCDA should deny this Project based upon the major modifications requested as well as community concerns about traffic impact and other infrastructure needs. Thank you.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Ms. Caywood, can I ask you a question?

THE WITNESS: All right.

MR. CHING: You oppose the developer's modification request for 107-foot versus 65.

THE WITNESS: Right.

MR. CHING: And you note that the curb cut next to the Lexus building is too close.

THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. CHING: So I ask you if we were to limit the parking garage to 65 feet and move the curb cut, would you support the Project?

THE WITNESS: Well, I can't say that I would support it but I don't know that I could object to it. If it met all the basic requirements of Mauka Area Rules it would be hard to object to it.

MR. CHING: Okay. Ms. Black, same question.

THE WITNESS: It would be moving in the right direction. There are a lot of other considerations involved, but we would welcome any corrections, I guess you could say, or changes to the way it is now.

MR. CHING: So you have the same objection. Neither of you mentioned the fact that the tower's 400-foot tall. It's 84,000 square foot of lot and the footprint of the tower itself is actually not very great, but in the greater scheme of things. I was just trying to -- is your objection to the height of the parking garage?

THE WITNESS: Well, there isn't time in 3 minutes to tell you all of our objections. There's the high density of the Project is a concern, and the number of cars and the traffic that would be generated is a concern. But I think the two that I mentioned,
which is about all we could tell you about in 3 minutes, are the primary concerns.

MR. CHING: I would encourage you, you know, because, just because that if you have other concerns that you want to raise, that you can do this in the form of written correspondence. And I know you're very quite clear and concise, Ms. Caywood, when you write. So we would certainly be able to receive and understand what other issues besides the parking garage height and the curb cut modification that you would object to or support or otherwise.

Ms. BLACK: I think we were concerned that we didn't want to keep repeating something that was talked about before so we just concentrated on a couple things. But I think perhaps something written to summarize everything that we've discussed at the other hearings would be good.

MR. CHING: Sure.

Ms. BLACK: Put it all together.

MR. CHING: Especially if, again, some of the modifications that are requested relate to the setback along Kapiolani Boulevard and whether it's a 6-foot wall versus a 3-foot wall. If you folks, again, if those modifications are, you know, again, if you have great dissatisfaction with them it would be
good for us to hear that and then know that then if those modifications were addressed that the Project would then be all right or not. It would still be good for us to know.

MS. CAYWOOD: Well, thank you for asking. Actually we even have some advice for the developer because the 6-foot wall I think is there because they have units on the ground floor. I don't think that they need 5 units on the ground floor unless it's just to make a huge profit. Because the space could well be used for some amenities that are lacking in the Project. They could have a recreation room, a card playing room. They could even have a child care center. There's all kinds of things they could use in lieu of 5 units on the ground floor.

We have a lot of ideas, but there isn't time to express them. But if you would like something in writing we'll work on that.

MR. CHING: Sure. Please know that everything you submit to us will be forwarded to the Authority for their consideration.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. We'll work on that.

MR. CHING: Thank you. That's if for those people who have signed up to testify on the first
docket, KAK13-057. Is there anyone else here who
would like to speak on this particular development
permit application? Okay. Hearing none, I'm going to
move to the next item. This is again KAK13-091 803
Waimanu. Again I have 2 people signed up. First is
Clara Morikawa. Ms. Morikawa?

THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. My name is
Clara Morikawa. Building a second multi-residential
building next to an already existing one with no space
between is like giving anyone easy access to the other
property. The open recreation space for 803 is
adjacent to Imperial Plaza's 6th floor lanais. I was
asked: "Is this allowed?"

It appears that developers are no longer
concerned about people's safety and welfare.
Forewarned is forearmed they say. So having
knowingly created, placed us all in this precarious
position will the developer be responsible for
burglaries or illegal entries? If developers can
ask for modifications and exemptions to the rules,
by the same token can't HCDA ask developers to make
concessions when safety and security becomes an
issue in the Project? Isn't this a give-and-take
situation?

This side-by-side building will certainly
diminish the value of our property. Who would want
to purchase our apartments when it can be easily
accessed from another building? When selecting an
apartment this is an important consideration.

With only 91 parking stalls for 153 units
it is presumed that there will be more pedestrians
on our streets. Both Waimanu and Kawaiaha' o between
Cooke and Ward are rough and rugged streets which
are unsafe and not pedestrian friendly.

In certain areas after a heavy rain the
street is a puddle from side to side. I do hope
that HCDA will make the developer fulfill his entire
obligation under the public facilities dedication
requirement.

The Mauka Area Rules were adopted to
protect the general welfare of the community. Under
the circumstances we ask that this Project be
rejected as it infringes on our right to privacy,
security and safety. Thank you.

MR. CHING: Thank you. Can I ask you a
couple questions?

THE WITNESS: Sure.

MR. CHING: Asked: "Will the developers
give concessions in exchange for modifications?" At
this point the developer is not asking for a
modification. But I'm curious as to what concession you would ask of the developer.

THE WITNESS: I would ask that his building not be placed side by side with ours. It's so scary to have somebody so close to you. All they can do, you can jump over to the one apartment or climb a ladder to get to the other from one building to the other. To me it's very unsafe. Even in a private residence you can't have 2 houses right next to each other.

If it was something else other than a multi-residential building, then that's another story. But these are living quarters. That's 153 units in that small little building.

MR. CHING: With respect to the public facilities dedication the developer is -- has committed to providing all the public facility dedication that he's obliged to by our rules. He will be providing a street frontage improvement. And whatever can't be given he's paying in lieu fee which is calculated according to our rules.

THE WITNESS: Right. But it's less -- he's giving less than a third. He's doing less than a third of what is required.

MR. CHING: Again, you know, our rules say
that if he needs to make certain frontage improvements, which means widen the sidewalk, at that particular area especially in Kawaiaha'o and, of course, on Waimanu side. And so those are counted towards public facility because that's a public facility. A sidewalk.

THE WITNESS: Right.

MR. CHING: But he has no more public facility to give. So our rules say that when you fix the sidewalk like that and you have no more to give then you can do a cash in lieu. So a cash in lieu because it's a square footage requirement. So he's obliged to pay $189 square foot price for any area that's short in terms of public facilities.

THE WITNESS: Can't he fix the road around his property?

MR. CHING: He may very well have to. Let's say as he digs up to make his connection to the sewer he may -- when he does that he may be obliged to, again, pave and repave to the city's satisfaction.

THE WITNESS: But that's only a small portion.

MR. CHING: Typically public facility improvements in Kaka'ako are done proportionally. So if you have a frontage, that you pay proportionally.
If it costs -- if we do a whole stretch you would only pay for that section in front of you. If we did a street improvement --

THE WITNESS: You mean half the street? He would pave just half the street?

MR. CHING: No, likely the whole street frontage. But in a situation like that if we wanted to repave and curb and gutter Kawaiaha'o Street, for instance, what we would do is we would assess all landowners proportionally according to their frontage.

So even Imperial Plaza would have to pay proportionally for that frontage which would be improved.

Typically our rules would provide that 27 percent of the construction cost is borne by benefiting landowners. That's typically by Rules. It's not guaranteed. So everybody always has to share where if the developer for 803 Waimanu digs up the road for whatever reason, he's going to have to restore the road. And typically they make it that he has to return it to a decent form. So it's at least going to be smooth in front of where he dug up.

THE WITNESS: Right. So that means that because 803 Waimanu is what it is and so is
Kawaiaha'o, that means they'll never, ever be improved? I mean going this way, you go property by property and everybody says, "No, we don't. We can't do it," or whatever. Then that means it'll never, ever be improved.

MR. CHING: You know, I see somebody in the audience that might be able to shed some light on it. But whenever you propose an improvement district in a particular area and you seek to restore the curb and gutter and sidewalks and roads and underground utilities and the like, we've had an experience in this particular area where the impacted landowners objected to the change and the costs and the particulars of the Project.

So therefore we abandoned the Project because why go someplace where they don't want you. So I think we're in a situation where we've tried with surveys. We've tried with going door to door and having design charrettes and talking about what frontages could look like.

But we could never get that kind of support. And I'm not talking about consensus. I'm talking about support which means people generally say that's a good idea.

So we couldn't get that kind of support.
So we will not pursue any project that people don't have support for. And I'm not, again, even talking about consensus.

So, unfortunately, it would appear that unless there is a design that, you know, or a need that the neighborhood sees as justifying their participation and giving support for a, in large part, legislative project to fix the road. Then, yes, it might not be fixed for some time.

THE WITNESS: You know, for 801 South the entry and exist from their property is Kapiolani, South and Kawaiaha'o. And people will be going right through Kawaiaha'o from Cooke to Ward. It's such a narrow little thing, you know, narrow little street. And the traffic is really going to be jambed in there.

MR. CHING: Sure. However, I suspect that for 801 South the access points are on Kapiolani Boulevard for Building B. For Building A it would be Kawaiaha'o Street. The South Street dropoff, that's not where you park you car and you can leave the garage that way. That's only a dropoff. So it's primarily Kawaiaha'o and again, Kapiolani.

I would suspect that if I were leaving and if I lived there in Building A I would either turn right to go to South Street on Kawaiaha'o and then
go that way or left. If I went left I would
probably go to Cooke. At Cooke I would turn left or
right. Left can get me to the highway and right can
get me to Ala Moana.

THE WITNESS: Remember you said that because
you've been driving Kaka'ako so much and you know
where all the heavy traffic is you'll go where you
think there's the least traffic.

MR. CHING: Mm-hmm.

THE WITNESS: Which would be between Cooke
and Ward you know, because you think, "Okay. Traffic
is" --

MR. CHING: Actually I see you folks all the
time. So I go home, I go straight up to Cooke and
turn right on King Street. I never go down Kawaiaha'o
because that's not a short cut for me. It ends up --
ending up on Ward is not a good place to be.

THE WITNESS: It isn't. Now you're going to
have South Street, you're going to have 801 South, and
then you're going to have 803 Waimanu.

MR. CHING: They would likely go to Cooke.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. But Cooke is already
jammed. So then they'll go onto Kawaiaha'o because
they're gonna try to take the easy way out but it's
going to be a stumbling block.
MR. CHING: Okay. Again, you know, that's the beauty of having these kinds of sessions that we can have this kind of interchange.

THE WITNESS: Right.

MR. CHING: I don't expect to convince you otherwise, but we can at least agree on or have a human scale discussion. So actually it looks like on the 'out' is on Kawaiaha'o, the 'in' is on --

THE WITNESS: Waimanu.

MR. CHING: Waimanu. So out they would have the option to go, again, right to go to Cooke or left to go Ward.

THE WITNESS: Ward or that Middle Street.

MR. CHING: If they go down Ward likely they'd make a right turn and not try to make a left turn because they would go down. Right?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

MR. CHING: Thank you. So next person to speak, signed up for this topic is again Mr. Lam. Mr. Lam, if you can identify yourself.

THE WITNESS: Sure. I'll just be within the 3 minutes. Well, again, good evening. My name is Steve Lam. I spoke on the Saturday comment, public comment session. I was speaking very broadly on both properties. So after some research I decided to
narrow down my property to speak on. And that would be 803 Waimanu Street.

From looking at the blueprints the height is the most attention-grabbing thing that anyone will see, especially if you are looking at it from a laptop or computer. Visualizing it, thinking about how it would be when you actually see it physically you might just think that it's not proportional to, say, Imperial Plaza because that's the most important, prominent building established at the moment.

Just speaking on that quickly and with the sources that I got on 803 Waimanu Street, that there are various numbers of units available. So possibly thinking about the different stories that can be constructed if there is still time, would be really appreciated amongst the public, myself and I'm sure HCDA.

The second thing to take into consideration is also the measurements of the building, requirements, regulations and certain constraints that will go accordingly with HCDA. The measurements are designed by professional engineers I'm sure.

However, with my review of just how
Kaka'ako has been developing that -- the spaces amongst the different applications, especially since new technology is is coming up, that there might be some issues with calculations especially with a developing economy. That's it. Thank you very much.

MR. CHING: Mr. Lam, can I ask you, again, for clarity you said that the height could be adjusted on...?

THE WITNESS: It should be taken into consideration if anything, yeah.

MR. CHING: So do you support or oppose?

THE WITNESS: I still support it. Is there any further questions?

MR. CHING: No. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. CHING: Is there anyone else wishing to testify on 803 Waimanu?

THE WITNESS: Unidentified speaker. Yes, I'd like to.

MR. CHING: Please come forward. And if I can ask you before you leave to complete one of these speaker registration forms. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. My name is Ron Schwabam. I'll refer to my notes, here, so please
bear with me. I wanted to speak to the 803 Waimanu regarding the developer's plan regarding adequate parking. I don't believe that the developer has an adequate parking plan.

There are 91 -- to my understanding there are 91 parking units planned for the proposed 153 units. Note that the units for the parking stalls are not conventional parking stalls. I call it like it is "roboto, mechanicalized carousel car conveyer system."

To my knowledge I'm not sure if you can fit an SUV in there. But you might need one because you might need the extra space because the apartment's relatively small.

There is no parking system similar to this in place in Hawai'i at a residential project of the scale that I'm aware of anywhere. Maybe in a commercial location, a car lot, a gas station, that's different.

But residential users, you know, they need to get in and out of their cars. The cars leak gas, oil, battery acid. If your car happens to be spinned over by a car that's leaking oil or transmission fluid, then it might hurt your car finish. I don't know. If I was living there I'd
have concerns if I had a car there.

Might trip off your car alarm system. If you have a dead battery, good luck. The developer proposes and states that it'll take 90 seconds for people to get in and out of their car. But if you use a car like I do you have flat tires, your battery's died, people like to work on.

They. You need to load and unload your car trunk from Costco groceries, strap in the kids, the babies, the dog -- if they allow dogs there -- I don't know that you, if you're waiting in line for that in 90 seconds on average.

So I question these stalls. They're not conventional and I don't think they should be given the same equal rating like a regular parking stalls like others in the area. Because of the system that's not really true improvement.

The concern is that 62 residents of the 153 won't have any parking stalls allocated to them. If they're making 80,000+, which is a lot more than a lot of people I know that have cars, really they're not going to buy a car, want to have a car? There's a BMW's Lexus Mini. They're all around you. But that's a concern.

So seemingly they're gonna bring their
car, try to bring their car in the area, and get it into other areas, legally, illegally.

With so many vehicles going in in the peak a.m. and p.m. hours there may be cars waiting in line on the street with Waimanu, not good, or the large condo at Imperial Plaza, or the large car dealer at BMW in addition to other businesses that use the area.

Kawaiaha’o is not much better. Also, I believe the plan was to have a 4-foot trench into the parking system. If there's flooding, sewage backup, power failures, I wish those people luck.

I really feel sorry for them getting access to their cars if they're stuck with such an unconventional parking system.

These are not parking stalls. I don't what it should be but I would not give them equal rating to a conventional parking stall.

My thought was on this Project, this wedding cake design of a building, perhaps should be in another area of Kaka'ako. (buzzer) Maybe HCDA can swap with them. I don't know. But the idea is give it a real parking, maybe put it along the rail line.

But something like that along the rail
line where people might minimize their need for parking would be better. But that area feels pretty quite filled now.

And the other last thing I just want to mention and I'll be brief, some of the pipes in the area's from 1897. I'm not sure about adequate water runoff.

If there are sewer concerns whether it merits another sewage pumping station I'm not clear. But I've not heard anything and haven't followed it completely. But if there's a problem and the EPA gets involved and there's fines and the city and the taxpayers will bear the brunt of that. Thank you.

MR. CHING: Thank you again. Can you pronounce your last name for Holly.


MR. CHING: Thank you. Ms. Morikawa, you can see a picture there of the -- (cursor adjustment) so this is the 803 Waimanu. So you can see here it's actually lower, a great height here so you'd have to climb up if you wanted to get through. There's another view from the mauka elevation. Again you can see that the difference in height it's lower. And you can see the other side. We asked the developer to flip this building around from a design standard.
THE WITNESS: (Ms. Morikawa) That was the first.

MR. CHING: So you wouldn't prefer it to be flipped back.

THE WITNESS: I don't want it to be right next to us. I mean that isn't right.

MR. CHING: Okay.

THE WITNESS: You can't have 2 multi-residential buildings side-by-side. You know it's not safe. There's no security.

MR. CHING: Okay. Is there anyone else who wishes to give testimony on this? Is there anyone else wishing to give testimony on either 803 or 801 Waimanu? Okay? Hearing none, I'm going to adjourn this portion of our supplemental public hearing and switch to our community briefing time. It's 6:09. Thank you, Holly. (pau)

(The supplemental public hearing proceedings were adjourned at 6:09 p.m.)
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HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: It's Saturday, December 14th. In accordance with action taken by the Authority on June 19 authorizing the executive director to schedule and conduct supplemental public comment sessions, that's our purpose in part for today's meeting.

It's designed to augment, not replace, the public hearings that have already been scheduled. I note that we're going to take on the format of our third Tuesday community briefing. And you also get a chance to speak informally to staff about the upcoming agenda for Kaka'ako and any items of interest.

So we'll be taking public comment on the one development permit application before the Authority at this time. All comments received for this development permit will be captured by our court reporter and forwarded to the Authority for their review. If you've previously testified at our public hearing, that testimony is already a part of the record. There will be no presentations by the Applicants.

However, their presentation materials is available for viewing at the back desk and table. Please do not remove these materials from the room.
as they're intended for all to view. Our procedures today was that I'll be taking comments for KAK13-091, 803 Waimanu Street.

Then after testimony for this Project has been taken I will dismiss our court reporter and will discuss informally with all present those questions that they might have for agency activities in the format of our regular community briefings.

I note just as a disclaimer that we are recording the hearing proceedings and so the intention is to create a record that the Authority might have and others might view. If there's no questions I'm gonna take in turn people who have signed up. And if you haven't signed up I'll give you an opportunity.

First, we have Clara Morikawa. Please come forward. Given the crowd I'm not even going to impose a three minute on you.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Please carry on.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Good morning.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Good morning.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: My name is Clara Morikawa and I'm with the Imperial Plaza. As one of several neighborhood zones Central Kaka'ako is said to support
the continued operation of service businesses such as repair shops and manufacturing or distribution as well as residential mixed-use projects which are defined as "occupied by business operator who lives in the same structure that contains retail activity."

Consequently, Rule 62-2 says there's no off-street parking requirement for the Central Kaka'ako neighborhood zone. However, 803 Waimanu is a combination of three small properties projected to house 153 apartments which then becomes a unique situation.

And to handle these unique situations rule 62-3 reads "When there's uncertainty as to the requirements for a proposed use the executive director will review and determine the applicable off-street parking requirement. The Mauka Area Rules are guidelines.

And the Authority was established to oversee and ensure that not only are the rules followed but where there are unique characteristics in projects, that HCDA impose reasonable standards, conditions or requirements to protect the public welfare.

Where is the logic in applying a rule which is relevant to one unit and applying it to a
project with 153 units? I would like to know. The FAR for Central Kaka'ako is 1.5. The May 2009 supplemental EIS said: Many small businesses continue to operate under adverse conditions. And improvements to the conditions will be needed.

When HCDA increased the FAR to 3.5 their explanation referred to 57D which reads, "When the Executive Director finds the public infrastructure is adequate to support a project, or where a project would construct improvements to said infrastructure and future developments, then the Executive Director may elect to waive the FAR limitation."

What is more important than that which has been overlooked is Rule 57A which applies only to Central Kaka'ako and which reads "This section intends to limit development within portions of the Mauka Area with known infrastructure deficiencies, until such time as availability of infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate the maximum level of development provided for by the Mauka Area Rules."

HCDA has publicly admitted, and I quote, "That there has been no infrastructure improvements to wastewater distribution, traffic controls and drainage."

The stakeholders in the Central Kaka'ako...
neighborhood have resisted any improvements to roadways and drainage facilities that would cause the loss of lands typically associated with the construction of city standard roadway facilities. Further, that there is no timetable for any improvements in the Central Kaka'ako neighborhood.

803 Waimanu will be making only minor changes to the infrastructure, contributing less than one-third of their public facilities dedication and obviously nothing to improve future developments.

So in this case the FAR must remain at 1.5. Then perhaps the Project will be properly designed and constructed and we will avoid all the safety concerns that are now envisioned. It was disturbing to find that the Project proposal and illustrations were not very clear and details not finalized before they were brought to the hearing.

Many questions were posed by HCDA to the developer who had no specific answers. Will the stormwater cistern have sufficient capacity and where would it be located? The traffic study had not been completed. Will the units be rented or for sale? What are the prices of the units? Who will finance? And there were a bevy of other questions.
It is unfair and a disadvantage to the community when we are required to evaluate a project with indefinite plans that will affect our living conditions and our safety. HCDA will be making their final decision in three weeks. And we still do not have the final details on the Project. Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: If I can ask some questions.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Sure.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: That was actually very nice testimony, very clear and concise, and you make a number of points. So in the interest of discussion we'll have some dialogue because, again, it's important for us to have an understanding. You raise questions.

In any case, please know that our procedure has been to note the questions that are raised and then respond directly to those questions at the decision-making because we are obliged to.

But I wanted to give you the benefit of hearing or having discussion at this point with the court reporter present so that the Authority will know that we had this discussion and interplay.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Could I say something?
HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Sure.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I brought up these points because I thought that if I brought this out at the final hearing....

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Too late.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: That's right. The Authority would already have made their -- mostly would have made their decision. So I thought if I brought it up before that it would be considered rather than just set aside.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: You know, that's -- quite frankly they're obliged to wait until the whole record is made before they make a decision. That includes testimony even received at the decision-making hearing. Although I'm not disputing that this is a good thing that you raise questions. These are similar questions that have been raised before but they do deserve answers. So I was going to take the opportunity to address that.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: First off, you noted that there's no off-street parking requirement in Central Kaka'ako. And that you noted from our rules that the executive director may impose certain standards on there in a unique situation.
PUBLIC SPEAKER: Right.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: I'm just noting that's your first point. Again, the reason that and you cited public comments that were made with respect to how stakeholders and tenants in Central Kaka'ako are feeling have been resistant to or not supportive of previous efforts to design some sort of general infrastructure improvement or improvement project.

You correctly cited statements that the Agency has issued. So again Central Kaka'ako is a unique situation. Some of these lots are 5,000 square feet. And it's very difficult for these small businesses to accommodate required parking on site as well as their physical development.

So the 2011 rules, after much, actually approximately eight years of development, concluded that we should allow for the current pattern of use and occupancy to continue to occur in Central Kaka'ako until such time that other changes are made.

So part of the HCDA mandate does specifically speak to preservation of some of the uses and activities and patterns of use in places
such as Central Kaka'ako. They specifically say that we should look to help preserve that existing pattern.

So adopting a no off-street parking requirement in Central Kaka'ako was a measure of that's consistent with what these small businesses typically have to endure.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Okay.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: And that they typically use street parking or they have parking in the right of public right-of-way as a part of doing business. So you cite to how there's a difference in 803 Waimanu in that there's going to be a hundred 53 units. And that we should -- and that there should be some consideration of this unique circumstance.

In this particular case the unique circumstance is that they're required on any residential development over 20,000 square feet to provide reserve housing. So that reserve housing number we have imposed on them that they must, because that's a part of our rule, that reserve housing units must have at least one parking stall.

So notwithstanding the fact that there's no off-street parking requirement in Central Kaka'ako, and 803 Waimanu is within Central
Kaka'ako, we have imposed that given that they're required by other parts of our rule to provide parking for reserve housing, that we've imposed it at a minimum they must provide parking for their reserve housing units. Hence there is a parking requirement. We have made that adjustment which is consistent with our rules.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: But that is 24 reserve, they have only 24 units that are reserve, right?

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Yes.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: When we talk about Central Kaka'ako it's a special zone. It's comprised of service businesses, small repair shop, manufacturing and distribution. These are all little things.

So one lot would have, would take care of the small business. And they have those residential mixed use projects. That is what Central Kaka'ako is supposed to be. I mean that's the way they've described Central Kaka'ako.

In that respect they said yes, you do not require off-street parking. But when you consolidate three of these small lots and put up a building with 153 units, what is the logic? How do you say that where you only can have -- where you have one little business so they don't need any
parking, they don't need off-street parking?

Then you say: Here is this building with 153 units and that same rule will apply? It doesn't make sense. Where is that logic? I don't understand. I don't comprehend.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: I've tried to explain it to you that within Central Kaka'ako we also have Kamake'e Vista, for instance, which is a large residential condominium. It is possible that other -- the current character is with 5,000 square foot, 10,000 square foot lots it's very difficult to assemble enough land to produce a project from a business point.

In this particular case, this is -- and there are 35,000 square foot lots that are in Central Kaka'ako. There are larger lots.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Mm-hmm.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: And larger holdings such as the Gas Company lot and others. So the rule was intended and there was much discussion which the Central Kaka'ako stakeholders doing rulemaking accepted that the market would determine whether or not a business without any -- which did, chose not to offer off-street parking could survive. So we let the market determine and we let the landowner choose in
this particular case. And this was a principle that was accepted by the Central Kaka'ako stakeholders.

   So while we can have a lengthy discussion, I think I've tried to explain to you that the rationale behind Central Kaka'ako's unique situation, which we did not force landowners or tenants to develop off-street parking, and instead allowed them to choose as they've done over the many years of existence in this particular area. And that the imposition that we have made consistent with rules is to require reserve housing parking.

   So, again, you gave testimony. You've made particular points. And given the number of people here please allow me to address your points and then afterwards we can also have discussion.

   PUBLIC SPEAKER: Can I just make one statement then?

   HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Sure.

   PUBLIC SPEAKER: Suppose there were three other similar projects for Central Kaka'ako. Let's say each one had 150 units. Are we gonna let 450 units with no parking spaces? Central Kaka'ako is not, it does not have all of those, the nice roadways and everything. They're all narrow like Waimanu and Kawaiahao. They're all narrow little streets.
To have 100 -- like this one 153 units with no parking -- well, Mr. Mola said he's going to have 91. Okay. But still to interpret it that way I think is wrong.

How can you have anybody with a -- let's say a combination of three properties because it's less than, like, a hundred fifty units, they all will have free parking -- I mean off-street parking? Nobody is required to have a parking space for their people? It doesn't make sense.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Since you asked to make a statement I'll leave that statement as is. The next point is that with respect to the public infrastructure determination. You've said that, and you've quoted, that there hasn't been an improvement project and district in Central Kaka'ako in recent times. Again that is certainly true.

In the public facility or infrastructure determination I noted the distance in feet from Cooke Street for hooking up to wastewater. I've indicated there that 1) There's no shortage of drinking water. There is not a power utility question being available.

There is not -- and given the proximity of a major transmission or distribution line on Cooke
Street that that's not a consideration; that the existing character in Central Kaka'ako is a lack of curb and gutter. And because of that that they're required to manage all stormwater runoff onsite. That's a very typical requirement when you do not have a public facility, the curb and gutter, to take away and manage storm water.

You question that the cistern will not be accurate or adequate. At this point typically zoning is the discretionary approval that says whether or not according to zoning rules a building or activity can be granted.

Subsequently, down the line, especially at building, prior to granting a building permit, the developer must present engineered solutions to demonstrate how X number -- and he must have an engineer's plan -- that indicates how much a structure will produce in terms of runoff, and then the accompanying engineering determination that the cistern system will be adequate. But cisterns are not, you know, a revolutionary technique. They're actually an accepted engineering technique.

But I wanted to tell you at this time we do not get into the engineering details at this point. That occurs prior to the granting of any
building permit. The next item that you bring up is the minimal contributions then by the developer. I think I've noted certainly the public facilities formula is quite straightforward.

He's going to meet with a combination of making roadway improvements or frontage improvements and contribution of those frontage improvements as public space. Again, that's by formula and by the rule. And then in accordance with the rule because he has no more space to or land to give up that he is allowed to do a cash in lieu contribution. You say that that's a minimum contribution to public infrastructure.

A typical condition on any landowner throughout Kaka'ako is (1) If we make an improvement on the infrastructure in the area it's typically funded by the Legislature. And that we're required to, by law, to establish a rule that says how each specifically benefiting landowner must proportionately then contribute to the improvement Project.

So whether or not and over and above the public facility dedication fee that any developer must pay in accordance with rule, when and if a public improvement project is designated for this
particular area, the landowner will be required by
rule to proportionately pay for a share of that
improvement.

And just for your general information. In
times past and other improvement districts
throughout the district, that equates to about
27 percent of construction cost. The rest of the
costs are borne by state tax dollars because it's
deemed to be in the public interest.

So I'm just answering your question as to
is he getting off by just paying a minimal fee and
will not have to participate in any future
improvement district project that would improve curb
and gutter and other utilities. I think I've
answered that that by rule he will be required, as
will all, and way of frontage on the street that
would be improved.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: It wouldn't be him that
will be paying. It would be the people who bought the
units, right?

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: He's indicated that
it's gonna be a rental. And it's a rental --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Oh, it's all going to be
rental now?

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: He's indicated
either for sale or rental. In the event it's a rental, certainly he will have a continuing stake. But you see that's true whether or not it's the original developer or the people who live there.

If and when we did an improvement on Waimanu, I'm sorry to say or Kawaiaha'o probably more likely, then Imperial Plaza residents would have to pay a proportional share of that improvement if it benefits the property.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Right.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: So whoever is there has that responsibility. Next, in terms of you say that there's -- the details presented by the developer and subject to questions that the Authority raise of the developer, that you say that that presents an incomplete picture for decision-making.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Right.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: I just have to, again, offer that the questions about: What is your intentions? Are you going to keep it for sale or for rent? And they raised the possibility that they might want to use the other units as reserve housing credits to be sold, bartered with other developers.

And the questioning that followed simply has to do with, you know, if you do that there's
certain requirements such as the parking requirement, that will have to be met.

With respect to what's before us it's quite clear that we have a 153, 65-foot high. We have sufficient design presentation and concept here that we understand what the Project is.

The final detail as to whether or not he rents it, sells it as reserve housing or rents it as reserve housing is actually immaterial to the consideration of whether or not you can have 153 units.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: But isn't, like, the façade still not definite? The front, the frontage? There are 10 townhouses that will be -- that you'll access from Kawaiaha'o or Waimanu. Can you imagine people accessing from Waimanu and Kawaiaha'o? Waimanu is a service street.

Kawaiaha'o is irregular. It's rough. It's narrow. There's so much traffic going by. The street has -- I mean it's not safe for pedestrians. There's people sleeping in cars or homeless sleeping in cars, sometimes between the cars.

You have graffiti on the walls. It's not a safe street. I don't walk on the street after sunset. I never have.
HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Ms. Morikawa, I'm going to -- certainly I will accept that, but please know that how the Project design and the developer choosing to have front doors and stoops on street frontage, that's a project design choice. It isn't something that we would, that our rules speak to. Our rules don't forbid that somebody could have front doors for their units on the street frontage. There's just no prohibition for that. That's a project design issue. That's a choice of the developer.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: But wouldn't they be afraid for the people that buy?

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: You know, again, I'm not trying to be argumentative, but in Central Kaka'ako in any situation while the law might say: Okay, you can build something," but if nobody buys it then that's the market determination, right?

So somebody choosing to build something in a particular manner is subject to the rules that say: Is that appropriate in that exact location? We do not get into should you be--shouldn't you be having less front door stoops? Or shouldn't you have this or that? That's beyond what government does. We cannot regulate -- we can't regulate
stupidity. We can't regulate logic. It's on the landowner to determine what it is they want to do.

And then within the overall framework of what they want to do as it applies to the zoning rules that are in place, we're obliged then to say: Does it fit or does it not?

In this particular case unfortunately the developer does not request any modifications or variations from the rule. He's operating within the rule. So we're obliged to treat it as if it is any other request.

Whether it's within the rule or not we have to look at it and then we have to determine is it within the rule. If so we would have to be -- we have to have a basis for then saying: Here it is. Here's the facts. It's within the rule. Or here it is. These are the facts. It's outside of the rule and therefore it's discretionary. We can't grant.

But he's making no such request. As I have no vote it is, you know, it makes it very difficult for one to make a case that this application should not be approved. It is within the rules.

So with that, please know that our court reporter has captured your points in detail. If I
haven't addressed or at least provided some light on the questions that you raised, we can certainly talk about it more. But this discussion will be reviewed by the Authority. So, thank you.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Again, I thought your testimony was very concise. It spoke to your points very well. Thank you for doing that.

Do we have anybody else signed up? Since fair is fair I'm not going to be running a clock. Can you just identify yourself for the court reporter.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I'm Paula Tadaki. I live in Imperial Plaza. Clara was very, like you said, very clear. She was very detailed. And you answered a lot of questions, but I just wanted it to be on record my feelings of the Project. Okay. It's real simple.

My main concern or one of my concerns with the proposed Project is the number of off-street parking stalls provided. Believe it or not Clara and I did not get together on our testimonies but this is just my feelings. Ninety-two stalls for 153 units. That means 61 units will have no parking.

CLRsearch.com stated that in 2010 the
median vehicles per household in Honolulu was 1.7. We are not New York City, San Francisco or even Amsterdam where people bike, walk, and use public transportation. You may say that is where we want to be but in reality we are not there now and nor will we be there in 2014 or 2015.

Where will all the cars park? If you check Kawaiaha'o Street or Waimanu Street there's no on-street parking or not much. Why does the Mauka Area Rules say: There shall be no off-street parking requirements for Central Kaka'ako neighborhood zone?

Is it because it is intended primarily for industrial or mixed-use and the density or FAR should be 1.5? I know you addressed it but I just throw that out again. Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to provide comment? Thank you for filling out the sheets.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: My name's Eddie Johnson. I'm from Imperial Plaza. Good morning, Director.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Morning.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I guess like Clara said we're, you know, kind of waiting for some answers back on things. I know in the end you're going to prepare
a presentation to answer most of them. Again, I have that same fear that it's kinda like too late in order to influence the board's decision.

So I guess in my first testimony I kinda mentioned about some of the inconsistencies in the drawings. I guess I'll call out the drawing, A, A-2.3; A-4.3 and A-5.1 where you have the floor plan elevation at the building information model.

Floor plan seems to indicate walls facing the Imperial Plaza and some windows. And the elevation seems to depict all windows and a little bit of wall at the stairwells.

The VIN model also seems to indicate it doesn't match either one of those. So while I know you guys don't want to get too much into the design and engineering of it, I want to believe that the façade and how that façade may influence adjacent properties would be one of the concerns of the board in terms of making their decision.

I would also ask because of the inconsistency would that not dictate some sort of re-submittal so that we could get a better idea of exactly what is the building going to look like with respect to how it's going to truly affect the neighbors?
Additionally, there's incompleteness in terms of the landscaping. Yeah, they do show some trees and indicated some shrubs in the elevations. However, it doesn't really show exactly what's going to happen particularly if the developer's going to utilize complete storage of the stormwater and use that stormwater to irrigate the landscape.

I think it's essential that they show exactly the amount of landscaping that's going to be provided in this Project. I appreciate you, Director, bringing up that question regarding the stormwater management and the methodology.

Just running a few quick numbers here, looking at what could potentially be the worst case for a stormwater event for one month of approximately 1 and-a-half feet or 18 inches of stormwater accumulated. If you multiply that by the site area it's approximately 30,000 cubic feet, which is a lot of water.

If you look at the demands of the landscape that he has, he has approximately 34 trees and approximately a thousand square feet of lawn which equates to, I don't know, the water requirements for his landscape, maybe it's
1200 cubic feet. So he's got about 29,000 cubic feet of water, stormwater, that he has to retain and cannot emit to the stormwater system.

So what does that look like? I looked into the City code. Apparently the maximum height for any sort of storm water management retention system can only be 8 feet. So again it goes to -- this would be a significant change in the drawings without getting into the engineering, but in terms of what happens with the subsurface, the interaction with the parking that he's proposing.

I think it certainly deserves a rework and a presentation to the board to give them a true understanding of what it's like to store 30,000 cubic feet of stormwater on the site. And you can only store it for so long and it does go septic.

The general rule for detention is only about three days, then you have to release it. So then you're talking treatment to the water. If he treats the water will that then effect the landscape?

Additionally, there's some concerns if he's using that water to irrigate the recreation areas, and he's using chemicals and so forth to keep
the water acceptable, how might that affect the residents when, I don't know, their small dog starts licking the grass or something? I'm not sure.

But to me I know that there are some fairly strick health rules in terms of the quality of water that can be used for irrigation whether it be stormwater, gray water or otherwise.

The other thing I wanted to bring up, and I don't think it's been addressed, and I know the design board had some comments on it. I still wanna stick to my guns with respect to proximity of the building.

In my earlier testimony I mentioned that there's very few buildings that are within 30-foot standoff of another residential building. Well, if the recreation area is considered residential space, this has zero standoff.

There is no place in all of Honolulu, in all of Hawai'i where there's zero standoff between public space -- between residential spaces which draws me to the landscaping plan. There's a narrative in there. Basically it says the recreation deck can be used for large gatherings, dinners, et cetera, and that sort of thing.

And I don't believe the architect has
taken a close look at the acoustical effects that may cause additional harm to what this building is already doing to the adjacent site. Essentially his courtyard's a bathtub.

And I'm not an acoustical engineer but I've been in the business long enough to know that if you put one person down there and they speak it's going to bounce all over the place and shoot right up towards the adjacent property.

There are some noise limits that the city has imposed and the state has imposed. Typically they're at speaking volume. I would wonder if a large gathering of folks were to get together with a couple beers, have a good time, how that might affect the adjacent properties.

We were fairly successful in stopping the scooters driving through the streets. My thoughts I think deserve some consideration. I would ask the board when they look at their charter, because you had mentioned here that it doesn't make business sense to put a project in place because it's just not -- it doesn't make any sense.

But I want to believe that the HCDA is looking at it from a community perspective, not a businessman's perspective because the charter of
HCDA is for the community's benefit. So, again, I would ask they look at what the true meaning of HCDA stands for. And I believe it's the 206E HRS, if I'm not mistaken.

Then just the other points, and again going back to the community. You had mentioned that, yeah, there's -- he can pay, the developer can pay to not have to develop parklands, et cetera.

While the monies may go to the broader public, and I understand that that's great, again with the community in mind how is that monies will never go towards our park nextdoor? I don't see an extension of our park.

So I don't see any direct benefit to the immediate community for what the developer's paying to not have to develop that space.

Just one other point that you had mentioned to Clara as well as to Paula that the board reviews it for the rules. If it's in the rules there's nothing we can do. But I don't believe that's true. I believe most of the language does not have the word "shall" in it.

I believe there's certain terminologies you "shall do this," or you "may". That is what allows the board to exercise discretion. The
65 feet, for example, is an allowable. It's not a mandatory. So while he may be in the "allowable" it's the board's discretion to decide: Does this make sense? Does it follow our charter? Does it follow the core values of HCDA?

So I just have a real problem with that. It just seems like it's being explained as if the board has no choice with this particular development. I would argue that it does because they do have discretion in many attributes of this particular building. Thanks for giving me more than 3 minutes.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Since we had the discussion with Clara, and I wanted to be sure that's on the record and you raised several points. Please allow me to go through that. First, can I ask again. You started off. You showed the floor plans. You referred to A-5.7.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I did point to A-2.3 is the floor plans floors 5 through 7 I think or 5 and 6. Then A-4.3 the elevation that faces the condominiums. Unless I'm reading it wrong there appears to be some inconsistencies. The floor plan -- and it could be just choice of scale -- I'm not sure -- but it appears to be a wall in the floor plan. Then in the elevation
it shows something quite different. As you know I
appreciate your comments with respect to requested
draperies on the new development. Will that be
provided?

This is a very intimate setting, you know. It's, again, probably not much farther than being
this wall to where we could potentially have residents right there. I'm not sure what reviewer
guys saw. But I review drawings every day for acceptance.

To me I would kick it back and say, "You know what? What do you mean? Is this glazing? Is
this a wall? What is it?" Because it significantly impacts the adjacent property.

Think you got a block and white there. I'm not sure. The color ratio a little bit
different. But there's, again, some inconsistencies there. They do a little crop-out at the very end to
make sure they're blocking a certain area there. But doesn't seem consistent. I think they actually
show kitchens if I'm not mistaken on the floor plan.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Maybe you can --
after this we can go over it and you can point out
the --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Sure.
HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: -- the discrepancies that you see in the elevations. I'm not necessarily seeing it but I want to understand for sure.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: No problem. (pause) I did have one other point, Director.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Sure.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: The methodology or the systems for the cooling, the AC, it has the entire rooftop filled with photovoltaic. Is there going to be a compressor farm? He's gotta have something. It does not seem to be depicted on the drawings.

Again, this is from an acoustical standpoint not only for the new residents but for us as well. He's gotta have something. Those compressors have to reside somewhere. I just don't see it. To me that is pretty significant in terms of appearance and effect on the adjacent property.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Let me try speak to -- you raise questions about the elevations and we'll go over that just so that I can understand it. With respect to the landscaping plans at this point since these are still early drawings and subject to further review, especially before it goes to -- gets clearance on the building from the Building...
Department, I would guess that they're not final drawings.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Oh, I know they're not. I understand that.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Then with respect to your concern about the plan and design for the system and your notes about maximum heights for storage facilities and requirements for treatment, that's certainly something that at this point again, as I would pose can't be built until he shows that it's an engineered appropriately and that there is a specific plan.

That's something that perhaps from our standpoint, just so that you know, we review building code stuff. So the plans come back to us to see if it's for our sign off on the development permit. That's something that perhaps we can address as a condition in the development permit.

You mentioned proximity of buildings and very few buildings being in this particular situation. Unfortunately, I have a direct comp on that kind of distances.

It occurs on Kalakaua Avenue or Beretania Street, there's Hale Ikena which is a senior rental project. My uncle happened to live in there so I
visited that site. It's back into the Holomua project which is located on Kalakaua.

If you were to go look from the other side of the street into there you would see it's very much likely even closer than what we're talking about here.

So when you say "very few" unfortunately if there was a ban or a clear rule that you cannot, you know, in terms of distances then certainly that's something that would be something for us to apply.

But at this particular point, and it's unfortunate, there does not seem to be that kind of Best Practice that's employed elsewhere or even covered by our rules.

So I'm just obliged to say, you said, and I think your words were exactly "very few". Unfortunately if there is, an exception is typically of if there are there are. If there's a complete ban then there's, certainly it would speak against practice to have things so close, but I hear your point.

With respect to that and the acoustic impact: When Imperial Plaza was built that blank wall, 45 foot high, was put up on the property line.
And your neighbors were obliged to deal with that because that was allowed at that particular point.

Mr. Mola initially came forward with a plan that showed an equivalent blank wall up against the Plaza. I suspect that that would remove all doubt as to any acoustic impact or the like. So, you know, it is hard for me to say this, it gives me no pleasure to say, but you have a choice at this point as I see it. And this is only my opinion, that the developer could build a facing wall, a blank wall with no openings. And I believe that's allowed by law anywhere on the property line. You could be looking at a blank wall versus the rec deck.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: He showed us that proposal.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: So in that particular vein that blank wall would eliminate, quote, "acoustic impact" of any rec deck that's located next because you have a blank and there's no rec dec. So it would be as provided. And, again, I understand that's a difficult choice.

Those are things that certainly the Authority should wait to hear from you folks as to whether or not, which is a preference, should it go forward. Then that's something that we can
certainly insist on. But I take your comments that there are impacts of having activity, human activity next to, in proximity to each other. I just have to let that stand.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Would you agree that in the rules the 65 feet is written because it's allowable that it's discretionary?

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: I would agree with your interpretation that it's a maximum allowance and that there can be discretion given and it has to be in a total view.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Right. That's what I was trying -- when we went through the first development I think you were kind enough to come out and take a look at the situation. I go back to my towering effect. The effects are the same, just not as many people.

I guess my question what's the criteria for the discretion? Because you don't have a vote I'm searching for what the board may use as their criteria to make their decision on this knowing that the language from the effects of the larger tower would not change for the smaller one.

It would be the same thing basically. I forgot what the board had said in their summary, but it was basically unacceptable, would have
detrimental effects on the adjacent property, et cetera.

It seems to be the same situation, just not as many people. So I guess my question is how many people does it need to affect before it's, you know --

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: There's no doubt there's effect in terms of proximity. I think the difference between the two applications was a 250-foot tower is clearly a tower.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Understand. Understand.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: But a 65-foot structure is a 65-foot structure.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Understand, yeah.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: So again tower spacing doesn't come into play. So that's why in the other case clearly there was impact and effect from the tower spacing. It was a discretionary ask as to give that additional height which we declined to.

So in terms, again, there's still impact whether it's a 65-foot building or a 250-foot tower I understand that there's impact. But, again, we cannot apply a tower rule, spacing rule, against a 65-foot building.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I understand. I understand.
I was just hoping the board scratches their head and does, "Hmm, this sort of has the same sort of effects, it's just not as many people."

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: I think your statement should stand for itself. That is the truth of it that there are impacts and effects. And, again, there are only hard choices for me to offer.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I understand.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: You noted that there's no direct benefit for the immediate community on the public facility dedication fee. That's also a situation where typically the public facility dedication fee is that -- okay. If you got the land, you give us land we try to aggregate it into a park type situation.

If you don't have the land you can't force it from them. They don't have the land. So there's an in lieu fee. If you noted, though, any improvement district is heavily underwritten by the state Legislature.

I indicated that even -- and that's consistent throughout, small, big or sideways, the formula typically does not place the full cost and share upon the landowners.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I understand.
HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Again, 27 percent of construction costs typically is a small fraction of the overall costs. Even though there's no direct benefit, again any improvement district would seek to benefit all at largely the state's expense. So that's not likely to be satisfactory to you.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: When I hear HCDA I just look for the definition of community and the extent of it. If we're going project by project, you know, could it be narrowed? Because if the developer was forced to do something on the building it certainly would influence its shape and size, et cetera.

So in my view it looks like buying that off to avoid having to reconfigure anything rather than saying, "I'm a good guy. Tell you what, I'm going to give you the $300,000 to do a park somewhere." That's all. I know where you're coming from.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: You know in terms of design and in terms of we do look at the building, any development, must make sense and meet certain guidelines. It's not just: Okay, if you build a box and there's no windows and it's 65 feet high, that's fine.

But this particular developer has shown
his determination in coming back very quickly with a
design that does, quite frankly, allow for
fenestration or openings appropriate for each one of
the units.

And it's done in a way that it is -- this
is no endorsement -- but it is efficient because it
does seem to work. It's very similar to what was
done on that rental project on Beretania Street
especially with this setback and the way -- it's
easy to produce a building that meets all building
code in terms of openings and the like. I'll just
leave that.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I know it relates probably
to the LEED requirements. I know he's trying to -- I
guess that's why I go back to his comment, his window
or in pursuant of the LEED credits and introducing the
outside air into the space, proposing floor-to-ceiling
sliding glass doors. But I don't see that in the
plans. I don't see it in the elevation, quite
honestly. So it's not clear to me even from a LEED
perspective. I know you guys don't get into that.
But it seems inconsistent from the drawings.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Unfortunately the
LEED requirement is only on state buildings. So we
can't require private development that has no subsidy
or no participation to produce to that particular standard.

You did also mention the PV plans. From my understanding PV requires transformers to step the power up and down depending on the particular situation. And those installations are not typically governed by us, but I hear your admonition to check, be more concerned about acoustic problems. That might be related to it. That's something just for us to be cognizant of.

I think that the standard for PV construction would not come from us. It would come from being allowed by HECO and a contractor following contracting laws in terms of installing that.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I guess it wasn't so much the PV. I guess it's where does the developer intend to put the compressors? Doesn't look like there's not much room.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Although I'm not sure the compressor's the term. I think it's transformer.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Not for PV but for AC.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Yes.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: The transformer, of course
for the PV I know that's located somewhere. He's got
to cool the building, especially those many units. Or
is he suggesting to have individual window units? I'm
not sure. But it doesn't look like there's enough
room for the mechanical on the roof at all. It's not
depicted on the drawings. I suspect he's going to
place it on the roof because he won't put it on the
rec deck.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: At the heart of
this -- again this is the purpose for this informal
type of discussion and I can accept comments back from
anyone in the audience -- is given that there's a
private property interest which he possesses, given
that there are rules saying: "Okay, you can do
certain things in this particular area," and he's
provided that, and given that there are impacts from
your guys' perception, this is two logical things.
1 -- and again hard question: Which do you prefer? A
blank wall or the rec deck?

Then 2. The larger question I think you
asked: How can you influence the Authority? Is
that what suggestions from a design side or from a
logical side would you make to still allow someone
to exercise their private property interest and
right to do as they please within rules and
mitigating impact upon you folks.

I'm not asking that answer be given now, but certainly we're going to have next week Tuesday at 5:30 you'll have another shot at this. But if you can offer suggestions as to how the developer might mitigate and how -- what conditions that you feel the Authority should impose which does not trample over his private property rights.

You asked me what could you guys come up with that would make the Authority want to do and employ discretion. I think I'm trying to answer that.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Okay.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: That if you can make certain suggestions looking as closely as you have at his design to mitigate effect. Those are things that, you know, are that's certainly allowable. We're required to look at it from a very specific analysis as to, you know, in terms of conformance with rule. Believe me we also look from a code standpoint too: Does this make sense? Can this be built? Therein lies our responsibility.

So, again, if it occurs to you and don't wait until next week Tuesday, if you come up with those ideas as a group or individually, please just
communicate that to me directly. And I'll include it in the record as a suggestion.

If you do that before Tuesday and then we can have some discussion as to what that might be, certainly the fact that this record is going to the Authority. And certainly that staff is obliged to do its analysis that we would have the benefit of those comments.

I'm sincere in saying that if you do have those comments or suggestions that we would entertain them. This is the time to entertain them.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Could I just ask one more question? In the rules there's no clear definition between a loft and urban block other than height allowance. It seems like the frontage rules apply both in the same way the open space requirements are the same. The only difference is that a loft has a limited height of 45 and urban block goes to a hundred.

And I'm just wondering if the intent of the rules because of the word "allowable" was included, that perhaps due to the industrial kind of area that we're in that they were thinking more loft type buildings in this particular area rather than the urban block which typically do rise higher.
It's post war type concept. It wasn't very successful. Mostly urban block was the result and remains left over public housing in a lot of areas.

But I guess that would be first and foremost one of my suggestions would be to look at the loft option which would reduce the density of the building. Could be very nice, quite honestly. I just throw that out there off the top of my head.

But the rules don't, if you call it "loft" this is your restriction. If you call it "urban block" it's that. It's only in name only. There's no other salient requirements.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: I need to give my court reporter a break. So why don't you hold on to that thought, we'll just take a quick break and then we'll start again. It's 11:07. We'll take a short break for convenience. You're off the record now.

(Recess. 11:10).

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: We're back on the record. This is a supplemental public hearing for KAK13-091, 803 Waimanu. At this point and it's 11:15, at this point is there any other persons wishing to provide testimony on this subject?

Hearing none, or seeing no requests then
I'm going to close the formal portion of our
supplement hearing and shift to our informal staff briefing. It's now 11:15. Thank you. So we're adjourned.

(The proceedings were adjourned at 11:15)
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HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Good evening. It's 5:30. My name is Anthony Ching. And I'm serving as hearings officer for the Authority. The Authority action in June of this year authorized the Executive Director to schedule and conduct supplemental public comment sessions. These sessions are designed to augment and not replace public hearings that have already been scheduled.

In addition, they serve to piggyback on third Tuesday community briefings that we typically have had for the past year at least, if not more, where it allows staff an opportunity to speak informally and answer questions from the community about the upcoming Authority agenda and items of interest.

We'll be taking public comment on the development permit application before the Authority at this time. That is KAK 13-091 803 Waimanu. All comments received for the development permit or this development permit will be captured by a court reporter, that's Holly right here, and forwarded to the Authority for their review.

If you've previously testified at our public hearing those testimonies' already a part of the record. There'll be no presentations by the
Applicant. However, their presentation materials are available for viewing at the back table. Please do not remove these materials from the room as they're intended for all to view.

So I'll be taking testimony on KAK 13-091. After testimony for the Project has been taken, I will dismiss our court reporter and will discuss informally with all present those questions that they might have for any agency activities in the form of our regular community briefings.

With that in mind, again, I will be giving you 3 minutes to discuss. We've had extended discussions on this. Typically, just for your information, I do take notes and we tried to incorporate concerns as best we can to conditions as appropriate. So today we have Ms. Morikawa. So if you can come up and identify yourself for the record. And please provide your statement. Good evening.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Good evening. I'm Clara Morikawa from Imperial Plaza. The proposed 803 Waimanu Project is a urban block type building which is allowed in Central Kaka'ako with exceptions. It will be a mass built boundary-to-boundary without any distinctive character and not in any way enhancing the
character of our neighborhood. The proposed Project is a 153 multi-residential building which will be built immediately next to the Imperial Plaza Townhouse with only inches separating the two buildings.

Its 5th floor recreation space and apartments will be adjacent to the Imperial Plaza's 6th floor apartments and lanai's so close that anyone can easily access the other property. Our rights to privacy, security and safety will be jeopardized. And we will no longer feel safe to leave our lanai doors open to let in the fresh air and breeze. Our safety net will be gone.

All the residents in our townhouses facing 803 will daily be exposed to their voices and activities. In comparing the two proposed projects by MJF Development we find that the number of floors was reduced from 27 to seven eliminating 20 floors, but the number of units dropped only by 64 from 217 to 153 making this a very dense building.

A reduction in the number of units would not only reduce the noise level, but it will be a saver environment for their residents. Could this be done? Two multi-residential buildings side-by-side creates an unsafe environment because in the event of a fire it will be difficult for the
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firemen to access either building. And it will
impede their ability to handle the fire from either
Kawaiaha'o Street or Waimanu Street or both. Being
so close a fire could also readily jump from one
building to the other.

It was suggested to me that perhaps an
open lane or walkway be created between the two
buildings for easy access by firemen and for their
residents as well, similar to the DAB report.

At the same time it will be separating our
two buildings and eliminating the fear for our
safety and security. Could this be incorporated?
Regardless whether safety was an issue, I was told
that unless it was in a give and take situation a
developer could not be asked to make any
concessions.

Quite to the contrary, Rule 15-217-4 says
the, "The provisions of the rules are minimum
requirements for the protection and promotion of
public health, safety and welfare. Satisfaction of
the minimum requirements does not mean that a
decision-maker cannot impose additional requirements
where appropriate."

Developers must care and be respectful --

(Timer buzzer)
HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Please continue but summarize.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Developers must care and be respectful of the environment and the lives of the people who will be affected.

For approval by HCDA the Project must not only be consistent with the Mauka Area Rules but the proposal must also protect, preserve or enhance the desirable neighborhood characteristics and that it be compatible with the planned use of the surrounding area.

In view of these and other objections earlier made, I feel that HCDA cannot approve this project at this time. Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Ms. Morikawa, I'm sorry, can I ask you a question?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Sure.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: With respect to your request for a fire lane, you understand that typically that fire lane because -- do you understand that the Plaza Tower is to your property line?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: You mean ours? Yes, it is.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: So then you would be requesting that this fire lane be entirely taken up on the side or the property of the MJF?
PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yes.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: And you believe that's reasonable?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Well, because he is building it, you know.


PUBLIC SPEAKER: But we were developed under separate rules, weren't we? Because we were --

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: There's similar zoning regime. And so --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: And we're also under -- we're not in central -- our Imperial Plaza is not Central Kaka'ako. It's outside.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: I'm just asking if you consider it fair that you're built to the property line that you would request a fire line that's entirely to the benefit of both properties, in your opinion, and you would have it all on the adjoining neighbor's property?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yes, because he's coming in.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Thank you. That's all I have signed up. Is there anyone else?

Mr. Johnson.
PUBLIC SPEAKER: My name is Eddie Johnson. I'm here, of course, to oppose, but I'm also here to kind of follow up on earlier testimony this week on Saturday where the Director kinda indicated to perhaps offer some suggestions that we might have outside of what we've typically been testifying for.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Please proceed.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: So with that, haven't had a lot of time for some research, but it appears that from your very earlier presentation you had on reserved housing that there's about almost 1700 reserved housing units that are proposed to be built within Kaka'ako.

I believe that estimate was with the earlier MJF Development of -- and I'm not sure how many they had -- but it was quite a bit more than what they're offering in this new development.

This new development's offering 24 reserved housing. That number, if you look at it, is about 18,000 square feet that he's required to do based on the plan that's proposed. The floors 5 through 7 are about 24,000 square feet.

So I put on my thinking cap here and looked to see what might be some opportunities to meet half way here without penalizing the developer.
and allowing them to go forward with some sort of plan that could be built. Apparently, and I believe it's HRS 15-218 that that addresses reserved housing. This is 17J, I believe. It says that, "The Authority may suspend the requirements for reserved housing for a limited duration given sole judgment it determines that these requirements may unduly impede, preclude, otherwise negatively impact the primary objective of the Authority to promote development within the Kaka'ako community development district."

So I wonder if maybe with only 24 units being proposed and understanding that there's gonna be at least 1600 reserved housing units available, could you perhaps waive the reserved housing requirement on this development granting developer that additional 18,000 square feet, let him enter a loft type development which has limitation of 45 feet. Looking at his numbers it appears he would have more sellable area. It would provide him, perhaps, the flexibility (buzzer) --

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Please continue.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: -- provide him the flexibility to reconfigure his interior space to maybe not have a hundred fifty-three units, but just doing...
some quick sketching he certainly could do 12 units per floor, go up four floors and have about 48 units, still maintain reasonable parking, a parking spot per units. So we're not looking at 91.

There's some great opportunity there. I would ask that the board take a look at that option as a possibility as it is within their Authority, to, it appears, to suspend the requirement for reserved housing.

It seems to be, perhaps, forcing the developer to build his building the way he's building it. That's all I have at this time.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Okay. I have a couple of questions and some statements for you.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Sure.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: First of all, Mr. Johnson, that's very creative. But I would suggest that you take this up with the developer. And if you happen to get some traction with that idea that perhaps the developer has to make that amendment.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Understand. He would have to request that. Understand that.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: The second thing is that when you have that discussion you have to note
that our reserve housing rules currently are intended
where a developer has a lot greater than 20,000 square
feet and proposes new residential development.

Without subsidy or any government
assistance they're supposed to provide 20 percent of
their floor area for reserve housing. If you didn't
know it, and I suspect you didn't, reserve housing
floor area does not count towards the total density.

It's a bonus because we make a requirement. And
it's a private sector market development. So we
make a requirement.

So to ease the burden of that requirement
we do not charge the floor area for the reserve
housing units to the property. That's in our rules.

You're correct that we can choose to waive
those rules. If I were you, and speaking just from
a personal basis, then if you were to then approach
the developer and you said, "If the reserve housing
requirement was waived, would you build X number of
less floors?" Because that's important, right?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Correct.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: You don't want to
end up with the same shell --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Correct.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: -- without the
reserve housing. So the only way this works for you folks -- and I see where you're going -- is to see if the developer would go down that line and perhaps that is something that would present a win/win situation. So it might be the same shell, but you're going to have to say X number of floors lower.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Correct.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: And that with no reserve housing units he might alter his business plan because then it can all be perhaps marketed for sale or for rental units. However, I caution you that Mr. Mola has, the Applicant has indicated already that he might potentially want to market all units as reserve housing units.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Right.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: On a credit basis to be sold or bartered in the marketplace. While there are a number of requirements that he would have to meet before we could do that, and we have yet to see that presentation, I think now is the time for you to make that kind of presentation to him 'cause perhaps that is viable.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I know you don't have a vote, but what would be the pulse for the board? Would this be the first time this type of request
would go forward?

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: At this point in time it's unusual for us to turn down the provision of reserve housing units, but perhaps this might be one of those times given that it's not a ton of units, that it might be worthwhile to mitigate some of the impacts of the taller, albeit 65-foot, development on the adjacent tower.

I don't see why you can't ask that. If you can gain support for that idea and, you know, if there's no harm to, you know, Mr. Mola, because he's on a track to do something right now, then perhaps he would consider.

That's very creative. Just make sure you figure out how many floors you want him to eliminate because you don't wanna make that deal -- I mean, quite frankly, if you make that deal and you came to us and you said, "Okay. Give away the reserve housing units, and oh, by the way...."

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I understand.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: I don't think we would like it. There would be no support. There has to be a compelling reason why we would waive the reserve housing requirement. But, again, to me it's very much a possibility if you can get to that point.
So I would encourage you to, you know, broach this idea because, you know, you're trying to be creative. I would hope that he would listen to you folks. But remember there was sort of a negative relationship or it was adversarial.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: You can always go back, right?

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: So I would, again, that might be something that's worthwhile. I can say for myself that if parties come back agreeing to do something that's a way of working things out.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: That would cause him probably to have to resubmit. Is there any sort of...?

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: That might. Although if you guys aren't going to complain, I believe that he could alter his application so that it might be reduced.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Okay.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: With the same footprint but it might be reduced. So I think that's a possibility. I don't think he would take it kindly if he's forced to reapply.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: That was my point. I can go to him, but I can't speak for the board in what all
he may have to go through with the re-submittal or otherwise. So I have very little information other than saleable area, of course, us not badgering him.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: I commend you. And I gave you instructions to try to look for a way to mitigate the building. And you're taking it out of our hide, but still that's all right. I think, you know, please communicate to him that if you can work something out that reaches his business objectives then -- it sounds funny, but we're slave to the application that comes forward for a private development.

We can't tell the developer: You build it this high this wide. We have standards that you can build to. But it's up to the developer, the Applicant, to say what he wants to do with private property. Government cannot tell private property, "This is what you will do."

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Okay.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: But your suggestion is very commendable. If you happen to get a response and perhaps you need more time, or you need more information, please feel free to call my office and we'll try to assist in whatever way we can legally.

Mr. Mola has rights, due process rights, that we're
You folks have a right of being impacted to seek a solution, but it must be in this case amicable or mutually agreeable. So please proceed and let me know if there's any way I can help.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I'll give it a whirl. Just to close the loop. I don't think we ever got together on the conflict of the drawings that we spoke about earlier with respect to, I believe, it's the ewa elevation, window or wall.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: You know, really from a design standpoint, and I looked and I can see the elevation again. Whether or not there's window or walls, the code will speak to if you have window openings how they might be in the design of that.

Reconciling elevations at the zoning level is not -- it's not as imperative because these drawings are subject to the review by the city Building Department. When they review for the final they will approve the final.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yeah.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: So observance of code or translation from concept, design to the final drawing and construction schematics, that would be within the province of the city and county.
PUBLIC SPEAKER: I wasn't speaking from necessarily a code perspective. I was more in terms of fire protection. It was more the impact of windows, living spaces facing each other head on at that close a distance. And to me it's maybe a feature that the board might look at. And I mean you can't tell them, "Don't put windows," but maybe could. I don't know.

But it's just that's where I was going with that not necessarily from a code perspective but just exposure, privacy, et cetera.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Again, you know, I'm not sure -- our rules, our form-based rules that create the shell of the physical environment. So that shell then has to -- as long as it falls within the available parameters of the heights that are available to the developer, in this case 65 feet, the setbacks -- we don't typically dictate the exterior elevations and designs, only to the extent that if each room didn't have any openings, and obviously that would be glaring.

But in this case it would be a design preference or at a concept level. So I'm not sure how far we would get or how productive that would be. But if you like we can still talk about it.
PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yeah, just interested, you know, end of the day would it, in fact, are we facing a wall from a distance or would we be facing folks' living space and they're facing us?

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Sure. And as I've indicated we're receptive to whatever, you know, you folks, residents of Imperial Plaza, Plaza Tower might opine with relation to the side of the building and that design. And if it's your preference again to go wall we would -- or if he reduces the building and then you'd want him to flip it the other way, then to me those are options. Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else wishing to provide testimony? Step forward, identify yourself for the reporter and proceed.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Wayne Takamine. I'm a Honolulu resident, also participated in the Kaka'ako Makai Conceptual Master Plan as the chair of the Kaka'ako Makai Community Planning Advisory Council.

I guess one of the concerns -- and I am testifying as an individual -- but one of my concerns about the growth in Kaka'ako Mauka has to do with how it relates to Kaka'ako Makai at the 801 South Street here. I heard you use a model saying that we had 12,000 residents in Kaka'ako and that
the law calls for, I think, 2 acres for every
thousand people I believe for park space. That
might be correct or not. I think it's around there.

But I'm thinking that that's a little bit
deceiving when you put that in your report because
they're talking about the current population that's
not really -- my understanding is that the
population will grow with the additional condominium
towers.

So current proposals for Kaka'ako Makai is
taking away park space with a lot of lease and
commercial use. So I'm just hoping that in future
reports that you also include projected increases in
population and also how they might impact the
limited park space.

I noticed today there was another
development project for Ala Moana that will have
luxury residential inside Ala Moana Shopping Center.
If that proposal goes forward we will have more
population. Of course, every project that goes
forward in Kaka'ako Mauka will impact the area
little bit more and will require more park space.

I believe that Kaka'ako Makai is part of
the whole Honolulu area. It services not just
Kaka'ako itself but the greater, the greater
population in Honolulu area. I know that many of
the people I know from Manoa go to Kaka'ako for
ocean recreation, body surfing, surfing, et cetera.
Also people from the North Shore, if there's a good
swell they'll come down here also.

As stated in our vision and grading
principles it is the community's gathering place.
So I think there also should be a focus on what the
community can use as the resources in Kaka'ako Makai
and not just limit it to visitors.

I think in our Master Plan what was stated
is that the examples that what's good for the
community was good for people in the area usually
will draw people from, visitors will come in and
attract other people because they see (buzzer) a
generalization of a very good, well-thought out area
for gathering and participating. And I think --

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Can you summarize?
PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yeah. Basically it is
perceived by a lot of people that when you talk about
the needs for park space it appears a little deceptive
because you're using a number that is current
population and not really taking into consideration
what the overall growth of the Kaka'ako Mauka area
will be and how that's gonna affect the park space or
limited park space that we have now.

My conclusion is that our Kaka'ako Makai Master Plan was really built to maintain open park areas, open green spaces. And I think that's in that way our vision and guiding principles should be upheld.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Mr. Takamine, can I ask you a few questions?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Thank you. Yes.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: So what is your position on 803 Waimanu? Do you oppose? For? Or provide comments?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I am -- I am providing comments.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: So just comments. Then, Mr. Takamine, are you aware that 1,000 population in 2 acres of park is not a law? That it is a guideline in some use?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yes.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Okay. So it's a guideline. Are you also aware, then, that if we add 10,000 people with 5,000 units and that takes up to about 22,000 people if my arithmetic is correct. And with 50 acres of park that would say that we have enough park for 25,000 people. So projections it will
appear that we do meet that. Were you aware of that?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Well, I'm aware that --

okay. One.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: I think it's a yes
or no question. Are you aware of that?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I'm aware of it now.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Okay. Are you also
aware that Ala Moana Park, which is directly adjacent
to Kaka'ako has 76 acres, less the beach front. And
we do not compute it into parklands even though
Kaka'ako residents could certainly go to Ala Moana
Beach Park. Are you aware of that?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yes.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Are you also aware
that Thomas Square is 6 acres directly adjacent to
Kaka'ako for its residents to enjoy? Are you aware of
that?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yes.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: So that would be 81
more acres that Kaka'ako residents could enjoy but
it's not being counted. Are you aware of that?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I'm aware of it now.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Thank you.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I would just like to add --

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Thank you.
PUBLIC SPEAKER: Could I add?

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Thank you. You're done.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Because you are taking -- you're planning to take away park space from Kaka'ako Makai.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Mr. Takamine, does this proposal envision taking away park space in Kaka'ako?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: What it does it increases the population.

HEARINGS OFFICER CHING: Which can be covered by the existing park quotient if you use a guideline. Yes. Thank you for your testimony. Is there anyone else wishing to provide testimony? Hearing none, we're going to shift to the second portion. It is 6:02. Thank you, Holly.

(The proceedings were adjourned at 6:02 p.m.)
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I. PROJECT SUMMARY AND ENTITLEMENTS

Refer to the attached Table 1, *Project Summary and Entitlements*, as Exhibit A.

II. RESERVED HOUSING

The Applicant shall comply with the provisions of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title 15, Subtitle 4, Chapter 218, and Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules. The Applicant shall designate no less than twenty percent (20%) of the residential units in the Project as reserved housing units for purchase or rental according to income requirements and qualifying conditions established by Subchapter 3 of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules.

The Applicant may submit a reserved housing credit program for additional reserved housing credit for the Authority’s consideration at a later time.

The Applicant shall execute an agreement with the HCDA as to how the Project conforms to the provisions of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules and such agreement shall be binding upon the Applicant and any successors in interest. No construction of the Project shall commence unless the Applicant has provided satisfactory documentation to the HCDA that the Project conforms to the provision of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules.

III. INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

Infrastructure improvements can be divided into two categories: (1) infrastructure improvements or requirements which are immediately necessary to proceed with the Project; and (2) improvements which are necessary to improve and upgrade the vicinity in total through the HCDA District-Wide Improvement Program.

A. Improvements Necessary to Proceed with the Project: With regard to infrastructure improvements or requirements which are necessary to proceed with the Project, the Applicant shall be responsible for providing necessary developer improvements.

B. Improvements Proposed for the HCDA District-Wide Infrastructure Improvement Program: As part of the HCDA District-Wide Improvement Program, road and utility improvements are being undertaken in increments throughout the Kakaako District, financed in part through an Improvement District Program.

In this regard, the Project shall be subject to assessments for its pro rata share of the cost of improvements which may, in the future, be necessarily undertaken in the vicinity of the respective projects under the HCDA or other government agencies’ improvement
programs. The Project will be assessed under the same methods and in the same manner as other properties in the area.

In order to ensure the participation of the Project, the Applicant, and its successors and assigns, shall agree to participate in the HCDA District-Wide Improvement Program at the time said program is implemented. The terms specified in the agreement shall be made a part of all condominium and conveyance documents for the Project and said documents shall be reviewed and approved by the HCDA prior to submission to the Real Estate Commission and execution.

IV. DECISION

The staff report for the Development Permit application dated January 8, 2014 is hereby incorporated into this Development Permit and made part of this Permit. The Development Permit for the Project is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:

A. Provide a Development Agreement with the HCDA that binds the Applicant, and its successors and assigns, individually and collectively, to develop and to maintain the Project site in conformity with the provisions of this Development Permit and with the Mauka Area Rules. This Agreement shall be recorded as a covenant running with the land with the Bureau of Conveyances or the Assistant Registrar of the Land Court. Proof of such recordation in the form of copies of the covenants certified by the appropriate agency shall be submitted to the HCDA.

B. Comply with all applicable requirements of Subchapter 2 (Regulating Plan and Neighborhood Zone) of the Mauka Area Rules.

C. Comply with all applicable requirements of Subchapter 3 (Thoroughfare Plan and Standards) of the Mauka Area Rules.

D. Comply with all applicable requirements of Subchapter 4 (Area-Wide Standards) of the Mauka Area Rules.

E. Comply with all applicable requirements of the Kakaako Reserved Housing Rules, Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title 15, Subtitle 4, Chapter 218.

F. Comply with all requirements as specified under Parts I., II. and III. of this Permit.
G. Conduct an Archaeological Inventory Survey that is acceptable to Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Division prior to HCDA approval of the initial building permit for the Project. Comply with all Conditions imposed by the Authority with respect to any Historic Properties, Aviation Artifacts or a burial site that may be discovered at the Project site.

H. Comply with any other terms and conditions as required by the HCDA Executive Director to implement the purpose and intent of the Rules.

All conditions shall be met prior to the issuance of the initial Building Permit for the Project.

Dated at Honolulu, Hawaii, this 8th day of January, 2014.

HAWAII COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, State of Hawaii

By ____________________________
Brian Lee, Chairperson

Attachment: Exhibit A - Table 1, Project Summary and Entitlements
## I. PROJECT SUMMARY AND ENTITLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mauka Area Rules</th>
<th>Required/Allowable</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Zone and Land Use</td>
<td>HAR §15-217-23(a)(2) Neighborhood Zones, Figure 1.2 Regulating Plan, Figure 1.9 Land Use</td>
<td>Central Kakaako (“CK”)</td>
<td>CK housing project</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules; residential use is permitted in all zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Oahu TMKs: 2-1-049: 50, 70 and 72 21,192 SF</td>
<td>See Project Plans Sheet A-1.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Figures 1.3 &amp; NZ.5 D Building Form, Maximum Density</td>
<td>21,192 SF (Site Area) x 3.5 FAR = 74,172 allowable SF; Reserved Housing (“RH”) excluded from floor area calculation, per §15-218-18(1).</td>
<td>71,012 SF, excluding floor area for RH. RH floor area is 17,994 SF.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules; see Sheet A-1.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved Housing</td>
<td>HAR §15-218-17(a)</td>
<td>At least 20% of the total residential floor area to be allocated for RH units (i.e., 17,896 SF in this project).</td>
<td>Excluded floor area for RH is 17,994 SF.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules; see Sheet A-1.2. Applicant may submit a separate proposal for additional reserved housing credit to the Authority at a later time for its consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Mauka Area Rules</td>
<td>Required/Allowable</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height</td>
<td>Figures 1.3 &amp; NZ.5.1</td>
<td>65 FT from “Ground Elevation”, excluding rooftop mechanical room (Block 24 on map).</td>
<td>65 FT from “Ground Elevation”, excluding rooftop mechanical room and stair(s).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Figures 1.3 &amp; NZ.5 A Building Types, and BT-8 Urban Block</td>
<td>Urban Block</td>
<td>Urban Block</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Types</td>
<td>Figures 1.3 &amp; NZ.5 B Frontage Types</td>
<td>Stoop; Dooryard; Terrace Front; Forecourt; Shopfront; Chinatown Shopfront; Kakaako Frontage</td>
<td>Stoop frontage on both frontages, as allowed in Figure FT-2.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Occupancy</td>
<td>Figure 1.3 Building Placement Frontage Occupancy at Build-to-Line</td>
<td>No build-to-line specified at Kawaiahao and Waimanu frontages, but requirement is 75% occupancy if build-to-line were required.</td>
<td>Project places frontage at property line on both the Waimanu and Kawaiahao frontages; ground level contains about 75% occupancy by active uses.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Mauka Area Rules</td>
<td>Required/Allowable</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Placement</td>
<td>Figure NZ.5 CK and Figure NZ.5-1</td>
<td>Build-to-lines at Waimanu and Kawaiahao – Not Specified Side and Rear Setbacks – 0 FT</td>
<td>Building built to property line except for recessed “stoops” at levels R-1 and R-1.5 areas at Waimanu and Kawaiahao frontages (see Sheet A-1.2).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Plate</td>
<td>Table BT-8.1, Maximum Floor Plate Ratios for Urban Block buildings</td>
<td>100% lot coverage allowed on floors 1 through 4 (21,192 SF in this project); average of 60% coverage on floors 5 through 7.</td>
<td>20,229 SF on Levels R-2; 12,136 SF (average 60%) on Levels R5 through R7 (see Sheet A-1.2 and A-3.1).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Figure BT.8 Urban Block E. Open Space</td>
<td>15% of Site Area = 3,179 SF 40 FT minimum dimension.</td>
<td>8,477 SF, with 40 FT Dimension on R2 and R5 (i.e., 3,148 SF on R2 and 2,953 SF + 2376 SF on R5).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Space</td>
<td>§15-217-56 Landscape and Recreation Space</td>
<td>55 SF of recreation space per dwelling; 55 SF x 153 dwellings = 8,415 SF in this project; if outdoors, may be used to satisfy open space requirements.</td>
<td>8,477 SF, with 40 FT Dimension on R2 and R5 (i.e., 3,148 SF on R2 and 2,953 SF + 2376 SF on R5).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules. See Sheet A-1.2 and L-1.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Mauka Area Rules</td>
<td>Required/Allowable</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>§15-217-63(e)(2)</td>
<td>No off-street parking required in CK zone, but RH requires 1 parking stall per unit; 24 RH units in this project.</td>
<td>91 parking stalls in multilevel unattended semi-automated mechanical parking including 24 parking stalls (12 standard and 12 compact) for the 24 RH units; see Sheets A-1.2 and A-2.1.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§15-218-18(a)(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§15-218-55(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Loading</td>
<td>§15-217-63(l)(1)</td>
<td>1 loading stall for 20,000-150,000 SF of floor area; one stall to have minimum dimensions of 12 FT x 35 FT and 14 FT vertical clearance.</td>
<td>1 handicap van loading space and 1 loading space with dimensions of 12 FT x 35 FT and 14 FT vertical clearance provided in garage; see Sheet A-2.1.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Loading Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>§15-217-63(m)</td>
<td>Short- and long-term bicycle parking to be provided within 400 FT of building entrance 400 FT of building entrance. Front facades to have at least one encroaching element (e.g., porch, balcony) for at least 10% of facade.</td>
<td>Short-term bicycle parking provided. Short-term and long-term bicycle parking provided in parking garage on ground level of parking garage.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Mauka Area Rules</td>
<td>Required/Allowable</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Massing</td>
<td>Figure BT.8 H</td>
<td>Front facades to have at least one encroaching element (e.g., porch, balcony) for at least 10% of facade.</td>
<td>Plane break provided.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities Dedication</td>
<td>§15-217-65(d)</td>
<td>4% of total residential floor area less RH (2,840 SF in this project).</td>
<td>866 SF provided in widened sidewalk along Kawaiahao frontage (see Sheet A-1.2 and A-2.1.</td>
<td>Request for remaining requirement to be satisfied by payment of in lieu fee, per §15-217-65(d)(3) approved by the Authority at its January 8, 2014 Public Hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>§15-217-56 Landscape and Recreation Space; Figure 1.7 Street Tree Plan</td>
<td>Provide automatic irrigation system with rain or moisture sensor; no street trees required on Waimanu Street, but Tulipwood tree required on Kawaiahao Street.</td>
<td>For landscaped open space, automatic irrigation system with rain sensor control; two Tulipwood trees provide on Kawaiahao Street.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Building Standards</td>
<td>§15-217-59 Requirement for Green Building standards</td>
<td>Qualify for base LEED rating; document achievement of LEED points.</td>
<td>Project will meet base LEED rating.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules for basic certified standard; see LEED rating sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Mauka Area Rules</td>
<td>Required/Allowable</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Placement</td>
<td>Figure 1.10B Parking Placement Figure BT.8 Urban Block</td>
<td>Place parking with allowed parking zone, per map; upper floors of parking to be screened from view of the public frontage by a liner building or by landscaping, green screens or cladding.</td>
<td>Parking placed within allowed parking zone; ground floor parking concealed by liner of habitable space on Levels R-1 and R- 1.5.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Access</td>
<td>§15-217-63(c)(3) Figures 1.14 and PZ.5</td>
<td>Curb cuts shall be set back a minimum of 22 FT from adjacent properties.</td>
<td>Driveways are more than 22 FT from side property lines on both frontages (see Sheet A-2.1).</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Zone Treatment</td>
<td>Figures 1.14 and PZ.5</td>
<td>Pedestrian Zone width standards: Waimanu Street (service street) sidewalk to have 6-foot wide Throughway; Kawaiahao Street (street) sidewalk to have 2-foot wide Frontage, 6-foot wide Throughway, and 5-foot wide Furnishing zones.</td>
<td>Pedestrian Zone on Waimanu frontage to retain existing improvements, except for relocation of driveway curb cut; Kawaiahao frontage improved to conform to prescribed Pedestrian Zone standards.</td>
<td>Project conforms to Rules; see Sheet L-1.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>