



City and County of Honolulu Primary Urban Center 2018 Survey

Set of Responses

**Prepared for Raimi + Associates
and the City/County of Honolulu
October 2018**

Prepared by:



Appendix A: Complete Set of Responses (Random Sample)

Table 1: Question 1

| How many years have you lived in the Primary Urban Center (PUC)? | Percent | Number |
|--|---------|--------|
| Less than 2 years | 12% | 101 |
| 2-5 years | 13% | 113 |
| 6-10 years | 14% | 119 |
| 11-20 years | 17% | 145 |
| More than 20 years | 46% | 401 |
| Total | 100% | 879 |

Table 2: Question 2

| Area | Percent | Number |
|--------|---------|--------|
| Area 1 | 18% | 165 |
| Area 2 | 21% | 187 |
| Area 3 | 18% | 161 |
| Area 4 | 23% | 206 |
| Area 5 | 20% | 176 |
| Total | 100% | 895 |

Table 3: Question 3

| How concerned, if at all, are you about the following current or potential issues and challenges facing the PUC? | | Very concerned | Somewhat concerned | Not at all concerned | Total |
|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Cost of housing | % | 77% | 19% | 4% | 100% |
| | N | 679 | 171 | 37 | 887 |
| Quality of housing | % | 50% | 40% | 9% | 100% |
| | N | 444 | 358 | 82 | 884 |
| Poor/aging infrastructure (roads, sewers, drains, etc.) | % | 77% | 21% | 2% | 100% |
| | N | 678 | 186 | 22 | 886 |
| Homelessness | % | 77% | 19% | 5% | 100% |
| | N | 674 | 163 | 43 | 880 |
| Inadequate job opportunities or low pay | % | 49% | 39% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 425 | 339 | 110 | 874 |
| Traffic congestion | % | 65% | 31% | 5% | 100% |
| | N | 572 | 272 | 40 | 884 |
| Lack of public transportation options | % | 21% | 46% | 33% | 100% |
| | N | 184 | 400 | 292 | 876 |
| Excessive growth and development/overcrowding | % | 54% | 33% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 484 | 291 | 113 | 888 |
| Tourism impact on residents/natural resources | % | 33% | 43% | 24% | 100% |
| | N | 290 | 377 | 216 | 884 |
| Preparing for sea level rise/climate change | % | 43% | 39% | 18% | 100% |
| | N | 383 | 342 | 162 | 887 |

Table 4: Question 4

| Given that between 2020 and 2040, the Primary Urban Center is expected to grow by approximately 22,000 residents and 35,000 jobs, what types of development, if any, do you think are appropriate for neighborhoods in the PUC? | | | Increased Housing | Retail/ Dining | Office/ Services | No development | Total |
|--|---|-----|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Wai'alaie-Kāhala Mall area | % | 39% | 34% | 25% | 42% | 100% | |
| | N | 298 | 260 | 191 | 316 | 758 | |
| Kaimukī (esp Wai'alaie corridor) | % | 39% | 33% | 27% | 41% | 100% | |
| | N | 298 | 248 | 201 | 311 | 757 | |
| Kapahulu | % | 36% | 32% | 25% | 44% | 100% | |
| | N | 264 | 236 | 186 | 325 | 737 | |
| McCully-Mō'ili'ili-Lower Mānoa | % | 43% | 32% | 28% | 37% | 100% | |
| | N | 323 | 245 | 212 | 278 | 753 | |
| Ala Moana-Kaka'ako | % | 33% | 28% | 28% | 50% | 100% | |
| | N | 251 | 217 | 216 | 384 | 764 | |
| Makiki-Thomas Square | % | 35% | 29% | 21% | 46% | 100% | |
| | N | 258 | 213 | 157 | 343 | 738 | |
| Civic Center-Downtown | % | 29% | 33% | 31% | 42% | 100% | |
| | N | 210 | 244 | 227 | 310 | 734 | |
| Kalihi-Pālama | % | 48% | 33% | 28% | 32% | 100% | |
| | N | 357 | 240 | 207 | 237 | 739 | |
| Liliha-'Ālewa | % | 42% | 32% | 21% | 39% | 100% | |
| | N | 304 | 230 | 153 | 284 | 720 | |
| Chinatown- Nu'uaniu | % | 38% | 30% | 28% | 41% | 100% | |
| | N | 288 | 228 | 217 | 312 | 765 | |
| 'Aiea | % | 47% | 34% | 33% | 33% | 100% | |
| | N | 359 | 265 | 255 | 256 | 771 | |
| Pearl City | % | 51% | 34% | 34% | 31% | 100% | |
| | N | 401 | 269 | 268 | 243 | 785 | |
| Other | % | 50% | 20% | 20% | 44% | 100% | |
| | N | 195 | 77 | 79 | 172 | 388 | |

Percents may sum to more than 100% as respondents could choose more than one option.

Table 5: Question 5

| How much, if at all, are increases in housing needed for each of the following groups in the PUC? | | Essential | High priority | Medium priority | Low/not a priority | Total |
|--|---|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Independent senior living facilities | % | 37% | 32% | 23% | 9% | 100% |
| | N | 320 | 278 | 197 | 74 | 868 |
| Assisted senior living facilities | % | 38% | 34% | 22% | 7% | 100% |
| | N | 330 | 291 | 189 | 58 | 868 |
| Income restricted housing for seniors | % | 38% | 32% | 24% | 7% | 100% |
| | N | 319 | 271 | 201 | 59 | 850 |
| Affordable housing at all income levels (rental or for sale) | % | 59% | 28% | 10% | 4% | 100% |
| | N | 509 | 240 | 86 | 34 | 869 |
| Government subsidized housing | % | 26% | 23% | 33% | 18% | 100% |
| | N | 222 | 197 | 277 | 154 | 850 |
| Accessible housing for those with disabilities | % | 29% | 31% | 32% | 8% | 100% |
| | N | 253 | 268 | 277 | 70 | 868 |
| Transitional housing for homeless families/individuals | % | 27% | 35% | 24% | 14% | 100% |
| | N | 235 | 298 | 207 | 125 | 865 |
| Student housing | % | 14% | 24% | 37% | 25% | 100% |
| | N | 124 | 205 | 318 | 215 | 862 |
| Group living opportunities/co-operatives | % | 13% | 16% | 39% | 32% | 100% |
| | N | 111 | 137 | 332 | 277 | 857 |

Table 6: Question 6

| Which, if any, of these housing building types does the PUC need most? | | Essential | High priority | Medium priority | Low/not a priority | Total |
|--|---|-----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------|
| Single-family homes | % | 36% | 22% | 23% | 19% | 100% |
| | N | 302 | 183 | 195 | 163 | 842 |
| Accessory dwelling units/second dwelling unit on lot | % | 22% | 23% | 31% | 23% | 100% |
| | N | 188 | 196 | 264 | 191 | 839 |
| Studios and micro units | % | 21% | 31% | 29% | 19% | 100% |
| | N | 177 | 261 | 244 | 163 | 845 |
| Townhomes, duplexes and triplexes | % | 23% | 27% | 31% | 19% | 100% |
| | N | 191 | 231 | 264 | 159 | 844 |
| Walk-up apartment housing (2-3 stories) | % | 20% | 26% | 33% | 21% | 100% |
| | N | 171 | 218 | 280 | 179 | 848 |
| Low-rise apartment buildings (4-6 stories) | % | 20% | 29% | 31% | 19% | 100% |
| | N | 174 | 252 | 263 | 166 | 854 |
| Mid-rise apartment buildings (7-12 stories) | % | 20% | 29% | 27% | 23% | 100% |
| | N | 174 | 251 | 232 | 199 | 855 |
| High-rise apartment buildings (greater than 12 stories) | % | 22% | 18% | 21% | 38% | 100% |
| | N | 191 | 153 | 183 | 329 | 856 |

Table 7: Question 7

| What types of short-term accommodation, if any, do you think are appropriate for each of these areas outside of Waikīkī? | | Resort hotels | Business hotels | Inns/budget hotels | Short-term rentals | None | Total |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------|-------|
| Ala Moana / Kapiolani Blvd area | % | 19% | 31% | 27% | 32% | 32% | 100% |
| | N | 160 | 266 | 231 | 269 | 273 | 847 |
| Civic Center/ Downtown/ Waterfront | % | 6% | 43% | 26% | 25% | 31% | 100% |
| | N | 53 | 360 | 214 | 212 | 261 | 835 |
| Near UH Mānoa/ University | % | 3% | 11% | 30% | 60% | 23% | 100% |
| | N | 25 | 96 | 253 | 501 | 189 | 832 |
| Airport area | % | 7% | 52% | 57% | 22% | 14% | 100% |
| | N | 58 | 442 | 487 | 189 | 122 | 849 |
| Stadium area | % | 6% | 18% | 41% | 32% | 34% | 100% |
| | N | 48 | 147 | 337 | 262 | 282 | 831 |
| Other | % | 8% | 8% | 18% | 23% | 59% | 100% |
| | N | 41 | 41 | 94 | 123 | 315 | 534 |

Percents may sum to more than 100% as respondents could choose more than one option.

Table 8: Question 8

| How strongly would you support or oppose each of the following options to increase the availability of affordable housing? | | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Don't know | Total |
|--|---|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|-------|
| Increases in building height | % | 19% | 25% | 17% | 33% | 7% | 100% |
| | N | 161 | 216 | 147 | 283 | 62 | 869 |
| Increases in building density | % | 15% | 25% | 25% | 26% | 9% | 100% |
| | N | 134 | 213 | 216 | 225 | 80 | 868 |
| Reduce parking in new developments | % | 6% | 11% | 27% | 49% | 7% | 100% |
| | N | 53 | 98 | 233 | 423 | 62 | 870 |
| Reduce open space requirements in new developments | % | 12% | 16% | 26% | 36% | 9% | 100% |
| | N | 108 | 138 | 229 | 314 | 81 | 870 |
| Promote micro-housing units (300 sf or less) | % | 22% | 40% | 16% | 14% | 8% | 100% |
| | N | 190 | 346 | 142 | 120 | 74 | 872 |
| Government subsidies through increased property taxes | % | 7% | 14% | 20% | 50% | 8% | 100% |
| | N | 59 | 126 | 178 | 434 | 72 | 870 |
| Other | % | 14% | 3% | 6% | 12% | 66% | 100% |

| How strongly would you support or oppose each of the following options to increase the availability of affordable housing? | | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Don't know | Total |
|--|---|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|-------|
| | N | 26 | 6 | 10 | 22 | 122 | 186 |

Table 9: Question 9

| How often, if at all, does any member of your household use a park in the PUC? | Percent | Number |
|--|---------|--------|
| Almost daily | 17% | 143 |
| A few times a week | 23% | 197 |
| A few times a month | 21% | 182 |
| Once a month or less | 20% | 175 |
| Never | 19% | 161 |
| Total | 100% | 859 |

Table 10: Question 10 (Rate Each)

| How much of a priority, if at all, should the development of the following types of new parks, open spaces or public facilities be for the City/County in the PUC? | | Essential | High priority | Medium priority | Low/not a priority | Total |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------|
| | Soccer, baseball or football fields | % | 14% | 17% | 37% | 32% |
| N | | 120 | 142 | 310 | 269 | 841 |
| Basketball or tennis courts | % | 13% | 18% | 40% | 29% | 100% |
| | N | 112 | 151 | 337 | 240 | 840 |
| Small pocket parks with children's play structures | % | 22% | 31% | 34% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 185 | 263 | 284 | 110 | 842 |
| Urban plazas | % | 11% | 21% | 32% | 36% | 100% |
| | N | 93 | 169 | 261 | 295 | 817 |
| "Parklets" (tiny parks that replace a parking space) | % | 14% | 13% | 20% | 53% | 100% |
| | N | 114 | 106 | 168 | 445 | 833 |
| Multi-purpose buildings with indoor gymnasiums | % | 16% | 21% | 35% | 27% | 100% |
| | N | 118 | 151 | 253 | 191 | 713 |
| Youth centers | % | 24% | 36% | 27% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 201 | 303 | 231 | 110 | 846 |
| Senior centers | % | 26% | 33% | 28% | 14% | 100% |
| | N | 220 | 281 | 237 | 116 | 855 |

| How much of a priority, if at all, should the development of the following types of new parks, open spaces or public facilities be for the City/County in the PUC? | | Essential | High priority | Medium priority | Low/not a priority | Total |
|--|---|-----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------|
| Larger neighborhood parks | % | 18% | 20% | 31% | 30% | 100% |
| | N | 152 | 163 | 261 | 253 | 829 |
| Passive green spaces with shade | % | 24% | 26% | 35% | 15% | 100% |
| | N | 200 | 218 | 297 | 128 | 843 |
| Linear parks with seating and walking/jog paths | % | 28% | 32% | 26% | 14% | 100% |
| | N | 235 | 271 | 223 | 115 | 844 |
| Community gardens | % | 24% | 25% | 30% | 21% | 100% |
| | N | 201 | 211 | 249 | 178 | 839 |
| Improved access to existing natural areas (hiking trails, beach access, etc.) | % | 31% | 27% | 28% | 14% | 100% |
| | N | 259 | 230 | 242 | 119 | 850 |
| Other | % | 21% | 18% | 34% | 27% | 100% |
| | N | 55 | 47 | 89 | 70 | 261 |

Table 11: Question 10 (Top 3)

| How much of a priority, if at all, should the development of the following types of new parks, open spaces or public facilities be for the City/County in the PUC? | Percent | Number |
|--|---------|--------|
| Soccer, baseball or football fields | 11% | 59 |
| Basketball or tennis courts | 8% | 42 |
| Small pocket parks with children’s play structures | 29% | 150 |
| Urban plazas | 10% | 51 |
| “Parklets” (tiny parks that replace a parking space) | 12% | 60 |
| Multi-purpose buildings with indoor gymnasiums | 12% | 64 |
| Youth centers | 33% | 173 |
| Senior centers | 36% | 188 |
| Larger neighborhood parks | 15% | 77 |
| Passive green spaces with shade | 27% | 141 |
| Linear parks with seating and walking/jog paths | 33% | 172 |
| Community gardens | 19% | 97 |
| Improved access to existing natural areas (hiking trails, beach access, etc.) | 38% | 198 |
| Other | 12% | 60 |
| Total | 100% | 517 |

Table 12: Question 11

| How strongly would you support or oppose each of the following options to pay to improve and renovate parks and/or build new parks and open spaces? | | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Don't know | Total |
|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Increase park fees charged to new development | % | 24% | 35% | 16% | 17% | 8% | 100% |
| | N | 206 | 306 | 140 | 147 | 72 | 872 |
| Increase taxes on hotels and other visitor-serving activities | % | 33% | 33% | 15% | 14% | 6% | 100% |
| | N | 288 | 285 | 128 | 117 | 50 | 869 |
| Additional tax assessment on property owners | % | 5% | 12% | 23% | 54% | 6% | 100% |
| | N | 40 | 105 | 202 | 469 | 53 | 869 |
| Increase the General Excise Tax (GET) and dedicate funding for parks | % | 8% | 20% | 26% | 41% | 4% | 100% |
| | N | 70 | 175 | 227 | 359 | 38 | 869 |
| Reallocate money from other public facilities and services | % | 16% | 35% | 17% | 19% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 141 | 303 | 150 | 162 | 112 | 869 |

Table 13: Question 12 (Rate Each)

| How concerned are you, if at all, about the following potential impacts from climate change and sea level rise in the PUC? | | Very concerned | Somewhat concerned | Not at all concerned | Total |
|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Increased flooding from rising seas | % | 49% | 36% | 15% | 100% |
| | N | 433 | 312 | 131 | 876 |
| Increased storm frequency and severity | % | 52% | 32% | 16% | 100% |
| | N | 455 | 283 | 139 | 878 |
| Increase in hurricanes and super cyclones | % | 50% | 32% | 18% | 100% |
| | N | 439 | 282 | 158 | 879 |
| Coastal erosion and loss of some beaches | % | 55% | 33% | 12% | 100% |
| | N | 487 | 288 | 105 | 879 |
| Rising groundwater levels | % | 43% | 41% | 16% | 100% |
| | N | 378 | 360 | 136 | 874 |
| Health impacts from rising temperatures | % | 46% | 37% | 17% | 100% |
| | N | 398 | 325 | 144 | 866 |
| Property damage or displacement (from flooding) | % | 47% | 41% | 12% | 100% |
| | N | 407 | 359 | 109 | 875 |
| Sewer backups and overflows | % | 70% | 24% | 6% | 100% |

| How concerned are you, if at all, about the following potential impacts from climate change and sea level rise in the PUC? | | Very concerned | Somewhat concerned | Not at all concerned | Total |
|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| | N | 618 | 214 | 50 | 881 |
| Flooded roadways with disruption of commuter travel and transit service | % | 55% | 35% | 10% | 100% |
| | N | 484 | 308 | 84 | 876 |
| Delayed emergency response (police and fire) | % | 62% | 26% | 12% | 100% |
| | N | 546 | 232 | 101 | 880 |
| Loss of electrical power and blackouts | % | 60% | 29% | 11% | 100% |
| | N | 521 | 258 | 96 | 876 |
| Pressure on public funds to combat sea level rise impacts (and less being spent on other services) | % | 41% | 43% | 15% | 100% |
| | N | 360 | 375 | 135 | 870 |
| Stricter building codes/requirements | % | 42% | 37% | 20% | 100% |
| | N | 370 | 326 | 177 | 873 |
| Decrease in coastal property values | % | 22% | 31% | 47% | 100% |
| | N | 189 | 269 | 405 | 863 |
| Other | % | 35% | 18% | 47% | 100% |
| | N | 53 | 28 | 71 | 152 |

Table 14: Question 13

| How strongly do you support or oppose each of the following methods to address sea level rise in areas that are or will be experiencing increased flooding? | | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Don't know | Total |
|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Immediately restrict new development in areas that will be subject to future increased flooding | % | 53% | 27% | 12% | 4% | 5% | 100% |
| | N | 468 | 234 | 104 | 31 | 40 | 876 |
| Gradually restrict new development in areas that will be subject to future increased flooding | % | 38% | 37% | 10% | 9% | 5% | 100% |
| | N | 325 | 323 | 90 | 81 | 45 | 865 |
| Allow development, but require higher ground-floors and/or raised roads through new building codes | % | 28% | 37% | 14% | 15% | 6% | 100% |
| | N | 243 | 319 | 126 | 128 | 54 | 869 |
| | % | 16% | 24% | 20% | 32% | 9% | 100% |

| How strongly do you support or oppose each of the following methods to address sea level rise in areas that are or will be experiencing increased flooding? | | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Don't know | Total |
|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Build sea walls to protect property against sea level rise and flooding, even if it causes beach erosion | N | 136 | 205 | 172 | 281 | 76 | 869 |
| Encourage coastal property owners to retreat to higher ground through City programs and incentives | % | 24% | 35% | 16% | 11% | 15% | 100% |
| | N | 206 | 300 | 134 | 98 | 126 | 864 |
| Do nothing (climate change is not happening) | % | 5% | 6% | 7% | 70% | 12% | 100% |
| | N | 38 | 50 | 53 | 550 | 98 | 789 |

Table 15: Question 14 (Rate Each)

| Considering limited financial and staff resources, in the next 5 years, how much of a priority should the City/County place on each of the following? | | Essential | High priority | Medium priority | Low/not a priority | Total |
|--|---|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Addressing sea level rise and climate change | % | 32% | 25% | 28% | 15% | 100% |
| | N | 272 | 213 | 242 | 126 | 853 |
| Building more affordable housing | % | 51% | 26% | 16% | 7% | 100% |
| | N | 441 | 226 | 135 | 56 | 858 |
| Addressing infrastructure deficiencies | % | 57% | 27% | 14% | 2% | 100% |
| | N | 487 | 230 | 115 | 19 | 851 |
| Improving vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility | % | 29% | 32% | 29% | 10% | 100% |
| | N | 249 | 271 | 252 | 82 | 854 |
| Sheltering the homeless | % | 31% | 25% | 30% | 14% | 100% |
| | N | 267 | 218 | 254 | 120 | 859 |
| Attracting new businesses and employers | % | 26% | 28% | 28% | 18% | 100% |
| | N | 218 | 235 | 240 | 150 | 843 |
| Other | % | 34% | 14% | 19% | 32% | 100% |
| | N | 45 | 19 | 25 | 42 | 131 |

Table 16: Question 14 (Top 2)

| Considering limited financial and staff resources, in the next 5 years, how much of a priority should the City/County place on each of the following? | Percent | Number |
|--|----------------|---------------|
| Addressing sea level rise and climate change | 27% | 146 |
| Building more affordable housing | 49% | 268 |
| Addressing infrastructure deficiencies | 58% | 317 |
| Improving vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility | 24% | 130 |
| Sheltering the homeless | 28% | 153 |
| Attracting new businesses and employers | 17% | 91 |
| Other | 5% | 29 |
| Total | 100% | 548 |

Table 17: Question 15

| How much education have you completed? | Percent | Number |
|---|----------------|---------------|
| 0 to 11 years of K-12 education | 1% | 13 |
| High school | 10% | 86 |
| Some college | 13% | 117 |
| Associate's or technical school degree | 12% | 103 |
| Bachelor's degree | 35% | 308 |
| Graduate/professional degree | 29% | 255 |
| Total | 100% | 882 |

Table 18: Question 16

| How much was your household's total income before taxes in 2017? Include income from all sources for all persons living in your household | Percent | Number |
|--|----------------|---------------|
| Less than \$19,999 | 5% | 42 |
| \$20,000 to \$29,999 | 5% | 42 |
| \$30,000 to \$39,999 | 8% | 65 |
| \$40,000 to \$49,999 | 5% | 43 |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 21% | 174 |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 19% | 164 |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 19% | 162 |
| \$150,000 or more | 18% | 152 |
| Total | 100% | 843 |

Table 19: Question 17

| How old are you? | Percent | Number |
|-------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| 18-34 | 27% | 227 |
| 35-54 | 34% | 292 |
| 55 or older | 39% | 332 |
| Total | 100% | 851 |

Table 20: Question 18

| What is your gender? | Percent | Number |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Male | 50% | 432 |
| Female | 50% | 439 |
| Total | 100% | 871 |

Table 21: Question 19

| Which category best describes your race? (Please check all that apply) | Percent | Number |
|---|----------------|---------------|
| Native Hawai'ian | 9% | 81 |
| Samoan | 1% | 5 |
| Micronesian | 0% | 1 |
| Other Pacific Islander | 2% | 17 |
| Black/African American | 3% | 27 |
| American Indian/Inuit | 1% | 10 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 3% | 24 |
| White/Caucasian | 28% | 245 |
| Japanese | 36% | 313 |
| Chinese | 21% | 183 |
| Filipino | 11% | 95 |
| Korean | 3% | 26 |
| Vietnamese | 1% | 8 |
| Other Asian | 2% | 20 |
| Other | 3% | 28 |
| Total | 100% | 868 |

Appendix B: Complete Set of Responses (Opt-In Sample)

Table 22: Question 1

| How many years have you lived in the Primary Urban Center (PUC)? | Percent | Number |
|--|---------|--------|
| Less than 2 years | 8% | 13 |
| 2-5 years | 12% | 20 |
| 6-10 years | 15% | 26 |
| 11-20 years | 16% | 27 |
| More than 20 years | 49% | 84 |
| Total | 100% | 170 |

Table 23: Question 2

| Area | Percent | Number |
|--------|---------|--------|
| Area 1 | 14% | 24 |
| Area 2 | 6% | 10 |
| Area 3 | 17% | 30 |
| Area 4 | 24% | 41 |
| Area 5 | 21% | 36 |
| 9999 | 19% | 33 |
| Total | 100% | 174 |

Table 24: Question 3

| How concerned, if at all, are you about the following current or potential issues and challenges facing the PUC? | | Very concerned | Somewhat concerned | Not at all concerned | Total |
|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Cost of housing | % | 80% | 18% | 2% | 100% |
| | N | 136 | 31 | 4 | 171 |
| Quality of housing | % | 52% | 37% | 11% | 100% |
| | N | 89 | 64 | 18 | 171 |
| Poor/aging infrastructure (roads, sewers, drains, etc.) | % | 78% | 21% | 1% | 100% |
| | N | 133 | 36 | 1 | 170 |
| Homelessness | % | 77% | 21% | 2% | 100% |
| | N | 131 | 36 | 4 | 171 |
| Inadequate job opportunities or low pay | % | 49% | 40% | 11% | 100% |
| | N | 84 | 68 | 18 | 170 |
| Traffic congestion | % | 61% | 33% | 6% | 100% |
| | N | 104 | 56 | 11 | 171 |
| Lack of public transportation options | % | 35% | 41% | 25% | 100% |
| | N | 59 | 70 | 42 | 171 |
| Excessive growth and development/overcrowding | % | 48% | 26% | 26% | 100% |
| | N | 82 | 45 | 44 | 171 |
| Tourism impact on residents/natural resources | % | 49% | 37% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 84 | 64 | 23 | 171 |
| Preparing for sea level rise/climate change | % | 57% | 28% | 15% | 100% |
| | N | 98 | 49 | 25 | 172 |

Table 25: Question 4

| Given that between 2020 and 2040, the Primary Urban Center is expected to grow by approximately 22,000 residents and 35,000 jobs, what types of development, if any, do you think are appropriate for neighborhoods in the PUC? | | Increased Housing | Retail/ Dining | Office/ Services | No development | Total |
|---|---|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------|
| | | | | | | |
| Wai'alaie-Kāhala Mall area | % | 50% | 47% | 46% | 27% | 100% |
| | N | 78 | 74 | 73 | 43 | 157 |
| Kaimukī (esp Wai'alaie corridor) | % | 53% | 53% | 48% | 25% | 100% |
| | N | 84 | 84 | 76 | 39 | 158 |
| Kapahulu | % | 58% | 51% | 40% | 23% | 100% |
| | N | 90 | 79 | 62 | 36 | 155 |
| McCully-Mō'ili'ili-Lower Mānoa | % | 68% | 54% | 46% | 17% | 100% |
| | N | 107 | 84 | 72 | 27 | 157 |
| Ala Moana-Kaka'ako | % | 65% | 48% | 48% | 25% | 100% |
| | N | 105 | 77 | 78 | 41 | 162 |
| Makiki-Thomas Square | % | 56% | 53% | 38% | 25% | 100% |
| | N | 88 | 83 | 59 | 39 | 157 |
| Civic Center-Downtown | % | 64% | 50% | 50% | 20% | 100% |
| | N | 101 | 79 | 79 | 32 | 158 |
| Kalihi-Pālama | % | 77% | 43% | 49% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 122 | 68 | 78 | 20 | 159 |
| Liliha-'Ālewa | % | 73% | 42% | 37% | 18% | 100% |
| | N | 112 | 64 | 57 | 27 | 153 |
| Chinatown- Nu'uuanu | % | 68% | 46% | 49% | 18% | 100% |
| | N | 107 | 72 | 77 | 28 | 157 |
| 'Aiea | % | 65% | 47% | 51% | 18% | 100% |
| | N | 99 | 72 | 78 | 27 | 152 |
| Pearl City | % | 66% | 49% | 56% | 17% | 100% |
| | N | 101 | 75 | 85 | 26 | 153 |
| Other | % | 56% | 33% | 35% | 36% | 100% |
| | N | 37 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 66 |

Percents may sum to more than 100% as respondents could choose more than one option.

Table 26: Question 5

| How much, if at all, are increases in housing needed for each of the following groups in the PUC? | | Essential | High priority | Medium priority | Low/not a priority | Total |
|--|---|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Independent senior living facilities | % | 37% | 31% | 25% | 7% | 100% |
| | N | 63 | 52 | 42 | 12 | 169 |
| Assisted senior living facilities | % | 36% | 32% | 27% | 5% | 100% |
| | N | 62 | 54 | 46 | 8 | 170 |
| Income restricted housing for seniors | % | 36% | 33% | 26% | 6% | 100% |
| | N | 60 | 55 | 43 | 10 | 168 |
| Affordable housing at all income levels (rental or for sale) | % | 73% | 18% | 7% | 2% | 100% |
| | N | 125 | 31 | 12 | 4 | 172 |
| Government subsidized housing | % | 28% | 26% | 29% | 17% | 100% |
| | N | 48 | 44 | 49 | 29 | 170 |
| Accessible housing for those with disabilities | % | 28% | 26% | 39% | 7% | 100% |
| | N | 47 | 44 | 65 | 12 | 168 |
| Transitional housing for homeless families/individuals | % | 36% | 31% | 27% | 7% | 100% |
| | N | 60 | 52 | 45 | 12 | 169 |
| Student housing | % | 18% | 21% | 38% | 22% | 100% |
| | N | 31 | 36 | 65 | 38 | 170 |
| Group living opportunities/co-operatives | % | 21% | 22% | 32% | 25% | 100% |
| | N | 35 | 37 | 53 | 42 | 167 |

Table 27: Question 6

| Which, if any, of these housing building types does the PUC need most? | | Essential | High priority | Medium priority | Low/not a priority | Total |
|---|---|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Single-family homes | % | 16% | 17% | 27% | 41% | 100% |
| | N | 26 | 28 | 44 | 68 | 166 |
| Accessory dwelling units/second dwelling unit on lot | % | 19% | 28% | 28% | 25% | 100% |
| | N | 32 | 47 | 47 | 43 | 169 |
| Studios and micro units | % | 27% | 31% | 28% | 14% | 100% |
| | N | 45 | 52 | 47 | 24 | 168 |
| Townhomes, duplexes and triplexes | % | 22% | 37% | 28% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 36 | 61 | 47 | 21 | 165 |
| Walk-up apartment housing (2-3 stories) | % | 20% | 30% | 30% | 19% | 100% |
| | N | 33 | 50 | 50 | 32 | 165 |
| Low-rise apartment buildings (4-6 stories) | % | 36% | 31% | 23% | 10% | 100% |
| | N | 59 | 51 | 39 | 17 | 166 |
| Mid-rise apartment buildings (7-12 stories) | % | 40% | 27% | 21% | 12% | 100% |
| | N | 67 | 44 | 35 | 20 | 166 |
| High-rise apartment buildings (greater than 12 stories) | % | 32% | 26% | 16% | 26% | 100% |
| | N | 53 | 44 | 27 | 43 | 167 |

Table 28: Question 7

| What types of short-term accommodation, if any, do you think are appropriate for each of these areas outside of Waikīkī? | | Resort hotels | Business hotels | Inns/budget hotels | Short-term rentals | None | Total |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------|-------|
| Ala Moana / Kapiolani Blvd area | % | 27% | 60% | 42% | 34% | 18% | 100% |
| | N | 45 | 101 | 71 | 58 | 31 | 169 |
| Civic Center/ Downtown/ Waterfront | % | 10% | 74% | 29% | 28% | 15% | 100% |
| | N | 17 | 122 | 48 | 46 | 25 | 165 |
| Near UH Mānoa/ University | % | 4% | 24% | 48% | 55% | 20% | 100% |
| | N | 7 | 40 | 79 | 91 | 33 | 165 |
| Airport area | % | 8% | 65% | 70% | 22% | 6% | 100% |
| | N | 14 | 112 | 120 | 38 | 11 | 171 |
| Stadium area | % | 9% | 35% | 54% | 34% | 26% | 100% |
| | N | 15 | 57 | 89 | 55 | 43 | 164 |
| Other | % | 13% | 15% | 39% | 35% | 46% | 100% |
| | N | 13 | 15 | 39 | 35 | 46 | 100 |

Percents may sum to more than 100% as respondents could choose more than one option.

Table 29: Question 8

| How strongly would you support or oppose each of the following options to increase the availability of affordable housing? | | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Don't know | Total |
|--|---|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|-------|
| Increases in building height | % | 30% | 30% | 14% | 24% | 2% | 100% |
| | N | 50 | 49 | 23 | 40 | 3 | 165 |
| Increases in building density | % | 41% | 28% | 13% | 16% | 2% | 100% |
| | N | 68 | 46 | 21 | 26 | 4 | 165 |
| Reduce parking in new developments | % | 31% | 22% | 16% | 29% | 1% | 100% |
| | N | 52 | 37 | 27 | 48 | 2 | 166 |
| Reduce open space requirements in new developments | % | 11% | 21% | 19% | 46% | 3% | 100% |
| | N | 19 | 35 | 32 | 77 | 5 | 168 |
| Promote micro-housing units (300 sf or less) | % | 37% | 37% | 13% | 10% | 4% | 100% |
| | N | 62 | 62 | 22 | 16 | 6 | 168 |
| | % | 20% | 29% | 13% | 35% | 4% | 100% |

| How strongly would you support or oppose each of the following options to increase the availability of affordable housing? | | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Don't know | Total |
|--|---|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|-------|
| Government subsidies through increased property taxes | N | 33 | 48 | 22 | 58 | 6 | 167 |
| | % | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Other | N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 30: Question 8: Other

| How strongly would you support or oppose each of the following options to increase the availability of affordable housing? | Number |
|--|--------|
| <i>Not answered</i> | 174 |
| Total | 174 |

Table 31: Question 9

| How often, if at all, does any member of your household use a park in the PUC? | Percent | Number |
|--|---------|--------|
| Almost daily | 22% | 37 |
| A few times a week | 26% | 45 |
| A few times a month | 28% | 47 |
| Once a month or less | 16% | 28 |
| Never | 8% | 13 |
| Total | 100% | 170 |

Table 32: Question 10 (Rate Each)

| How much of a priority, if at all, should the development of the following types of new parks, open spaces or public facilities be for the City/County in the PUC? | | Essential | High priority | Medium priority | Low/not a priority | Total |
|--|---|-----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------|
| Soccer, baseball or football fields | % | 13% | 16% | 33% | 38% | 100% |
| | N | 22 | 27 | 56 | 63 | 168 |
| Basketball or tennis courts | % | 11% | 20% | 37% | 32% | 100% |
| | N | 18 | 34 | 63 | 54 | 169 |
| Small pocket parks with children's play structures | % | 46% | 30% | 18% | 6% | 100% |
| | N | 77 | 50 | 30 | 10 | 167 |
| Urban plazas | % | 31% | 33% | 21% | 15% | 100% |

| How much of a priority, if at all, should the development of the following types of new parks, open spaces or public facilities be for the City/County in the PUC? | | | High priority | Medium priority | Low/not a priority | Total |
|--|-----------|-----|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------|
| | Essential | | | | | |
| | N | 52 | 55 | 35 | 26 | 168 |
| “Parklets” (tiny parks that replace a parking space) | % | 46% | 24% | 20% | 10% | 100% |
| | N | 77 | 41 | 33 | 17 | 168 |
| Multi-purpose buildings with indoor gymnasiums | % | 51% | 9% | 7% | 33% | 100% |
| | N | 22 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 43 |
| Youth centers | % | 25% | 37% | 30% | 8% | 100% |
| | N | 42 | 62 | 51 | 13 | 168 |
| Senior centers | % | 26% | 27% | 32% | 15% | 100% |
| | N | 43 | 45 | 54 | 25 | 167 |
| Larger neighborhood parks | % | 8% | 16% | 19% | 57% | 100% |
| | N | 13 | 26 | 32 | 94 | 165 |
| Passive green spaces with shade | % | 11% | 21% | 40% | 28% | 100% |
| | N | 19 | 35 | 66 | 46 | 166 |
| Linear parks with seating and walking/jog paths | % | 24% | 33% | 35% | 8% | 100% |
| | N | 40 | 56 | 58 | 14 | 168 |
| Community gardens | % | 29% | 30% | 29% | 12% | 100% |
| | N | 47 | 50 | 48 | 19 | 164 |
| Improved access to existing natural areas (hiking trails, beach access, etc.) | % | 21% | 27% | 36% | 16% | 100% |
| | N | 35 | 45 | 60 | 27 | 167 |
| Other | % | 40% | 32% | 19% | 9% | 100% |
| | N | 66 | 53 | 32 | 15 | 166 |

Table 33: Question 10 (Top 3)

| How much of a priority, if at all, should the development of the following types of new parks, open spaces or public facilities be for the City/County in the PUC? | Percent | Number |
|--|---------|--------|
| Soccer, baseball or football fields | 10% | 11 |
| Basketball or tennis courts | 10% | 10 |
| Small pocket parks with children’s play structures | 51% | 54 |
| Urban plazas | 27% | 28 |
| “Parklets” (tiny parks that replace a parking space) | 32% | 34 |
| Multi-purpose buildings with indoor gymnasiums | 8% | 8 |
| Youth centers | 30% | 32 |
| Senior centers | 28% | 29 |

| How much of a priority, if at all, should the development of the following types of new parks, open spaces or public facilities be for the City/County in the PUC? | Percent | Number |
|---|----------------|---------------|
| Larger neighborhood parks | 4% | 4 |
| Passive green spaces with shade | 11% | 12 |
| Linear parks with seating and walking/jog paths | 20% | 21 |
| Community gardens | 18% | 19 |
| Improved access to existing natural areas (hiking trails, beach access, etc.) | 25% | 26 |
| Other | 34% | 36 |
| Total | 100% | 105 |

Table 34: Question 11

| How strongly would you support or oppose each of the following options to pay to improve and renovate parks and/or build new parks and open spaces? | | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Don't know | Total |
|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Increase park fees charged to new development | % | 38% | 24% | 17% | 16% | 4% | 100% |
| | N | 65 | 41 | 29 | 27 | 7 | 169 |
| Increase taxes on hotels and other visitor-serving activities | % | 40% | 33% | 13% | 12% | 2% | 100% |
| | N | 68 | 56 | 23 | 20 | 4 | 171 |
| Additional tax assessment on property owners | % | 12% | 28% | 25% | 35% | 1% | 100% |
| | N | 20 | 48 | 42 | 60 | 1 | 171 |
| Increase the General Excise Tax (GET) and dedicate funding for parks | % | 12% | 27% | 25% | 35% | 2% | 100% |
| | N | 20 | 47 | 42 | 59 | 3 | 171 |
| Reallocate money from other public facilities and services | % | 12% | 29% | 26% | 24% | 8% | 100% |
| | N | 21 | 50 | 45 | 40 | 14 | 170 |

Table 35: Question 12 (Rate Each)

| How concerned are you, if at all, about the following potential impacts from climate change and sea level rise in the PUC? | | Very concerned | Somewhat concerned | Not at all concerned | Total |
|--|---|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Increased flooding from rising seas | % | 65% | 26% | 9% | 100% |
| | N | 111 | 44 | 16 | 171 |
| Increased storm frequency and severity | % | 62% | 29% | 9% | 100% |
| | N | 106 | 49 | 15 | 170 |
| Increase in hurricanes and super cyclones | % | 58% | 30% | 12% | 100% |
| | N | 100 | 51 | 20 | 171 |
| Coastal erosion and loss of some beaches | % | 71% | 25% | 4% | 100% |
| | N | 121 | 43 | 7 | 171 |
| Rising groundwater levels | % | 58% | 29% | 14% | 100% |
| | N | 98 | 49 | 23 | 170 |
| Health impacts from rising temperatures | % | 45% | 42% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 77 | 72 | 22 | 171 |
| Property damage or displacement (from flooding) | % | 48% | 39% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 82 | 67 | 22 | 171 |
| Sewer backups and overflows | % | 70% | 26% | 4% | 100% |
| | N | 120 | 44 | 7 | 171 |
| Flooded roadways with disruption of commuter travel and transit service | % | 65% | 31% | 4% | 100% |
| | N | 111 | 53 | 7 | 171 |
| Delayed emergency response (police and fire) | % | 59% | 33% | 8% | 100% |
| | N | 100 | 56 | 14 | 170 |
| Loss of electrical power and blackouts | % | 63% | 29% | 8% | 100% |
| | N | 107 | 49 | 14 | 170 |
| Pressure on public funds to combat sea level rise impacts (and less being spent on other services) | % | 55% | 32% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 94 | 54 | 23 | 171 |
| Stricter building codes/requirements | % | 35% | 35% | 30% | 100% |
| | N | 59 | 60 | 52 | 171 |
| Decrease in coastal property values | % | 13% | 22% | 65% | 100% |
| | N | 22 | 38 | 111 | 171 |
| Other | % | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 36: Question 12: Other

| How concerned are you, if at all, about the following potential impacts from climate change and sea level rise in the PUC? | Number |
|--|--------|
| <i>Not answered</i> | 174 |
| Total | 174 |

Table 37: Question 13

| How strongly do you support or oppose each of the following methods to address sea level rise in areas that are or will be experiencing increased flooding? | | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Don't know | Total |
|---|---|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|-------|
| | | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Immediately restrict new development in areas that will be subject to future increased flooding | % | 48% | 29% | 13% | 5% | 5% | 100% |
| | N | 81 | 49 | 22 | 9 | 8 | 169 |
| Gradually restrict new development in areas that will be subject to future increased flooding | % | 41% | 45% | 6% | 5% | 3% | 100% |
| | N | 69 | 75 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 168 |
| Allow development, but require higher ground-floors and/or raised roads through new building codes | % | 33% | 28% | 24% | 11% | 4% | 100% |
| | N | 55 | 48 | 41 | 18 | 7 | 169 |
| Build sea walls to protect property against sea level rise and flooding, even if it causes beach erosion | % | 8% | 11% | 27% | 51% | 4% | 100% |
| | N | 13 | 18 | 46 | 86 | 6 | 169 |
| Encourage coastal property owners to retreat to higher ground through City programs and incentives | % | 28% | 35% | 15% | 15% | 6% | 100% |
| | N | 47 | 60 | 26 | 26 | 11 | 170 |
| Do nothing (climate change is not happening) | % | 4% | 4% | 7% | 80% | 6% | 100% |
| | N | 6 | 6 | 12 | 129 | 9 | 162 |

Table 38: Question 14 (Rate Each)

| Considering limited financial and staff resources, in the next 5 years, how much of a priority should the City/County place on each of the following? | | Essential | High priority | Medium priority | Low/not a priority | Total |
|--|---|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Addressing sea level rise and climate change | % | 40% | 31% | 16% | 13% | 100% |
| | N | 68 | 53 | 27 | 22 | 170 |
| Building more affordable housing | % | 61% | 23% | 10% | 6% | 100% |
| | N | 105 | 39 | 17 | 10 | 171 |
| Addressing infrastructure deficiencies | % | 65% | 25% | 9% | 1% | 100% |
| | N | 112 | 43 | 15 | 1 | 171 |
| Improving vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility | % | 33% | 38% | 22% | 7% | 100% |
| | N | 55 | 64 | 38 | 12 | 169 |
| Sheltering the homeless | % | 28% | 34% | 25% | 12% | 100% |
| | N | 48 | 58 | 43 | 20 | 169 |
| Attracting new businesses and employers | % | 29% | 24% | 31% | 17% | 100% |
| | N | 49 | 40 | 52 | 28 | 169 |
| Other | % | 96% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| | N | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

Table 39: Question 14 (Top 2)

| Considering limited financial and staff resources, in the next 5 years, how much of a priority should the City/County place on each of the following? | Percent | Number |
|--|----------------|---------------|
| Addressing sea level rise and climate change | 33% | 38 |
| Building more affordable housing | 57% | 65 |
| Addressing infrastructure deficiencies | 58% | 66 |
| Improving vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility | 24% | 27 |
| Sheltering the homeless | 14% | 16 |
| Attracting new businesses and employers | 11% | 13 |
| Other | 6% | 7 |
| Total | 100% | 114 |

Table 40: Question 15

| How much education have you completed? | Percent | Number |
|---|----------------|---------------|
| 0 to 11 years of K-12 education | 0% | 0 |
| High school | 2% | 3 |
| Some college | 6% | 10 |
| Associate's or technical school degree | 5% | 8 |
| Bachelor's degree | 35% | 59 |
| Graduate/professional degree | 53% | 91 |
| Total | 100% | 171 |

Table 41: Question 16

| How much was your household's total income before taxes in 2017? Include income from all sources for all persons living in your household | Percent | Number |
|--|----------------|---------------|
| Less than \$19,999 | 4% | 6 |
| \$20,000 to \$29,999 | 4% | 7 |
| \$30,000 to \$39,999 | 2% | 4 |
| \$40,000 to \$49,999 | 6% | 10 |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 19% | 32 |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 10% | 17 |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 29% | 49 |
| \$150,000 or more | 26% | 44 |
| Total | 100% | 169 |

Table 42: Question 17

| How old are you? | Percent | Number |
|-------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| 18-34 | 28% | 47 |
| 35-54 | 32% | 53 |
| 55 or older | 40% | 68 |
| Total | 100% | 168 |

Table 43: Question 18

| What is your gender? | Percent | Number |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Male | 53% | 90 |
| Female | 47% | 80 |
| Total | 100% | 170 |

Table 44: Question 19

| Which category best describes your race? (Please check all that apply) | Percent | Number |
|--|---------|--------|
| Native Hawai'ian | 13% | 22 |
| Samoan | 1% | 1 |
| Micronesian | 0% | 0 |
| Other Pacific Islander | 1% | 2 |
| Black/African American | 3% | 5 |
| American Indian/Inuit | 2% | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 2% | 4 |
| White/Caucasian | 51% | 85 |
| Japanese | 28% | 46 |
| Chinese | 14% | 23 |
| Filipino | 7% | 12 |
| Korean | 3% | 5 |
| Vietnamese | 0% | 0 |
| Other Asian | 3% | 5 |
| Other | 4% | 7 |
| Total | 100% | 166 |