



University of Hawaii at Manoa

Environmental Center
Crawford 317 • 2550 Campus Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Telephone (808) 948-7361

October 2, 1985

RG:0061

Ms. Helen Takemoto
Environmental Resources Section
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Pacific Ocean Division
Building 230
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858

Dear Helene:

Social Issue Identification and Analysis
Kahana Bay Navigational Improvements Study

In response to your request of several weeks past, I have looked over the material you sent and the questions you posed with the following results:

Scope of work

The purpose of the study is quite vague. The alternative plans for which "the publics and their issues and concerns" are to be studied are not identified. A statement of the problem and the specific needs of the Corps would have been helpful.

Report (untitled)

1. Reading the report was a real challenge due to the poor quality of print (substandard dot matrix) and resulting frequently illegible xerox copy. I would strongly urge requiring an upgraded print quality on the final report.
2. Text could be significantly "tighter" grammatically. It is verbose and contains much unnecessary, irrelevant, or duplicative material.
3. Table A: Description of Interviewed Publics

I note the name of Dr. John Kraft, Geology Department, University of Denver. Is this a typo? I know of a Dr. John Kraft from the University of Delaware who was doing coastal geology along the north shore. Perhaps they are two different people?

4. Issues and Perceptions

The interview questions related to "Extent", "Duration" and "Intensity" each provided three categories for response. It is my understanding of currently accepted sampling practices that a finer set of alternative responses is preferable. I would have suggested five categories such as: always, usually sometimes, seldom, never. Actual numbers of people interviewed and those using the area but not contacted in the survey should be shown.

In response to your specific questions:

1. How is the report in general?

The report does not clearly specify the objective or purpose for which the study has been undertaken. It states that it has been prepared to perform a "Social Issue Identification and Analysis for Kahana Bay Navigation Improvements Study" but the reader is left asking why? What is being proposed that needs a social impact assessment?

On the positive side, there is a good deal of interesting historical data presented. However, there is almost no attempt to apply that data in a meaningful fashion to the "purpose" for which it presumably has been collected. For example, will it be necessary to remove the legendary rocks? If not, the quantities of text devoted to their discussion seems quite irrelevant to the project at hand.

The rationale presented to guard against interjecting bias by not raising specific questions and only recording what people initiate has both positive and negative ramifications. Since this study is being undertaken for a designated purpose, ie. the Corps is presumably planning a project in the area, it seems more accurate to me to include at least some specific questions in the survey pertinent to the known issues of concern.

2. Would you use it in your EIS?

If aspects of it are directly pertinent to the project being proposed, I would use those points in the EIS. I would not use the report in its present form as it contains unsubstantiated and potentially irrelevant information. I think it is most important that objective issues be separated from subjective issues in presenting data for EIS's. This is not to say that subjective issues are not important. Only that a distinction needs to be made. It is also important to indicate the number of people involved both in the interviews and those using the park who were not contacted for an interview, ie. the size of the sample vs. the size of the "universe."

3. Is the report valid (ie. creditable)?

I assume so. Certainly they appear to have done a good job in contacting a wide assortment of people. The interview information is interesting and there is no reason to believe that it has been falsified.

4. Does it meet the scope of work?

Yes, but the purpose of the "scope of work" was poorly defined. The remainder of the "scope of work" was fine.

5. Would you pay for the report.


Insofar as it meets the designated "scope of work," I would assume that one would have to pay for the report. From the standpoint of its utility in meeting EIS requirements, I would have serious reservations.

6. There is a good deal of interesting historical data provided in this study and it may be valuable to decisionmakers in arriving at "community-acceptable" solutions to issues involving Kahana park.

Decisions, however, need also to take into consideration the views and needs of those from adjacent communities and related occupations (fishermen) who could be affected by the actions or lack of actions proposed. The scope of the present study limited the input to the immediate Kahana area participants or direct representatives. Since Kahana Valley is a state regional park, other users of the area should be granted some level of input into the needs of the park.

Hope you will find my thoughts useful. Give me a call if you have any questions.

Yours truly,


Jacquelin N. Miller
Acting Associate Director

Enclosure

cc: Patrick Takahashi,
Acting Director, Environmental Center