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1.

Introduction and Summary.
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

This environmental assessment (EA) has been prepared pursuant to Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS), the Special Management Area Rules and Regulations of the County of Maui, and the Rules and Regulations Relating to Shoreline Setbacks for the Islands of Maui and Lanai, County of Maui. The EA is intended to fulfill the environmental requirements for a Special Management Area Use Permit (SMU) and a Shoreline Setback Variance (SSV) filed with the County of Maui Planning Department.

The EA presents information required by Chapter 200 of Title 11, Administrative Rules, entitled "Environmental Impact Statement Rules", prepared by the State Department of Health. This includes: identification of the petitioner; identification of the approving agency; identification of agencies consulted in preparing the assessment; a general description of the action's technical, economic, social and environmental characteristics; a summary description of the affected environment; identification and summary of major impacts and alternatives considered; proposed mitigation measures; and a determination of the significance of the proposed action.

1.2 Background

In July 1993, a joint application for a Special Management Area Use permit and a Shoreline Setback Variance, including a Draft EA, were submitted to the County of Maui Planning Department. In preparing this July 1993 submittal, a number of federal, state and county agencies were contacted for their comments. Appendix F includes reproductions of comment letters received during the pre-submittal consultation.

Upon receipt of the SMP/SSV application, the Maui County Planning Department sent copies of the application and Draft EA to the Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC). Notice of availability of the draft EA was published in the August 23, 1993 edition of the OEQC Bulletin, commencing a 30-day public comment period which ended on September 22, 1993. During this period, written comments were received from a number of federal, state and county agencies as well as one public comment. These comment letters are reproduced in Appendix G.
1.3 Development Summary

Applicant/Petitioner:  Kyo-ya Company, Ltd.
                  c/o ITT Sheraton Technical Services and Engineering
                  P.O. Box 8559
                  Honolulu, Hawaii 96830-8559
                  (808) 931-8888
                  Attention: Mr. D. Wayne Judd

Property Owner:  Kyo-ya Company, Ltd.
                  2255 Kalakaua Avenue, 2nd Floor
                  Honolulu, Hawaii 96815
                  (808) 931-8600

Preparers of Environmental Assessment:
                  Helber Hastert and Fee, Planners
                  733 Bishop Street, Suite 2590
                  Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
                  (808) 545-2055
                  Attention: Ms. Leslie Kurisaki

Property Location:  Kaanapali Beach Resort
                  Lahaina Judicial District, County of Maui

Tax Map Key:  2nd Division, 4-4-08:5

Site Area:  23.291 acres

Existing Land Use Regulations:
                  State Land Use District: Urban
                  Lahaina Community Plan: Hotel
                  County Zoning: H-2 Hotel
                  Special Management Area: Entire Site
                  Shoreline Setback: 150 feet

Existing Land Use: Sheraton Maui Hotel (510 guest units/"keys")

Proposed Action: Project proposes to renovate the hotel while maintaining the existing hotel room count and low density character of the site. The original Cliff Tower and Garden Tower will be renovated, with an additional floor added to the Garden Tower. A new one-story "Garden Wing" of guest rooms will be constructed adjacent to and makai of the Garden Tower and Cliff Tower. The "original lobby" at the top of Black Rock and the adjacent Discovery Room dining facilities will be remodeled. The Molokai Wing will be demolished and new guest room buildings will be constructed in approximately the same building footprints, with an additional floor. A new Seaside Village consisting of four (4) five-story structures, and a new two-story main lobby area will be constructed in the south/central portion of the site. New conference facilities along with portable food carts, retail kiosks, a health spa and tennis courts will be
located adjacent to the lobby, over a new parking structure. A swimming pool connected to a system of swimming waterways will be located directly makai of the new lobby area. In addition, a pool bar, luau area, putting green, and beach front promenade interconnected to the swimming pool/waterways are proposed for the makai area. Finally, the plan includes a concept design for renovation of an old pier located on the northern end of the site. The pier could serve as a staging area for future commercial and recreational boating activities.

Requested Permits/Variances: Special Management Area Use Permit
Shoreline Setback Variance

Accepting/Approving Agencies: Maui County Planning Department
Maui County Planning Commission

1.4 Definition of Terms

Project Area: The project area (also referred to as the "project site") is the 23.291 acre parcel (TMK 4-4-08:5) on which the Sheraton Maui Hotel is located.

Applicant/Petitioner: The applicant/petitioner is Kyo-ya Company, Ltd. The petitioner's mailing address is c/o ITT Sheraton, Technical Services and Engineering, P.O. Box 8559, Honolulu, Hawaii 96830-8559.

Proposed Action: The proposed action includes renovation and reconstruction of the existing Sheraton Maui Hotel, while maintaining the existing hotel unit ("key") count and low density character of the site. The project includes renovation of the existing Cliff Tower and Garden Tower structures; construction of a new Garden Wing of guest rooms; remodeling the Discovery Room dining facility and "original lobby" at the top of Black Rock; demolition and reconstruction of the Molokai Wing of guest rooms; construction of a new Seaside Village; construction of a new lobby/porte cochere; and creation of new conference facilities, pools and waterways, health spa and tennis courts, a luau area and a new parking structure.

The master plan also includes a concept design for renovation of the old pier located on the northern end of the site. The portion of the old pier owned by the petitioner is included in the application for Special Management Area Use Permit. (A portion of the old pier is owned by Amfac/JMB Hawaii, Inc.).
1.5 Alternatives Considered

Alternatives to the project which were considered include a "no action" alternative and a renovation phasing alternative. Both these alternatives were judged to be less favorable than the proposed project. The no action alternative was eliminated because of market demands, the need for the hotel to remain competitive, the desire to improve the efficiency of the hotel's operations, and the need to upgrade the physical facility to meet current County, State and federal requirements. The renovation phasing alternative was eliminated because of its adverse impact on guests and adjacent properties, its longer construction period and resulting higher development costs.

1.6 Summary of Probable Impacts and Mitigating Measures

Archaeological and Historic Resources

An archaeological inventory survey, including subsurface investigation, did not find any subsurface cultural deposits, burials or human remains. The study concluded that the proposed action will not affect archaeological or historic sites. As requested by DLNR State Historic Preservation Division, an archaeologist will be on-site during construction excavation to monitor any construction activities.

Traffic Circulation

The proposed project is not expected to adversely impact traffic circulation within the Kaanapali Resort or within the West Maui area. Although no new guest rooms are proposed, modest increases in restaurant and meeting space will result in a small increase in vehicle trips. The proposed increase in restaurant and meeting space is forecast to generate 41 additional vehicle trips during the a.m. peak hour and 44 additional trips during the p.m. peak hour. The Honoapili Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection will require improvements with or without the project. As a result, no mitigation measures are recommended with the proposed Sheraton Maui redevelopment. A mauka bypass road will improve intersection capacity in the longer term.
Infrastructure

The existing wastewater and water supply infrastructure are adequate to accommodate the demands of the proposed project.

The applicant will continue to work closely with Maui Electric Company and Hawaiian Telephone Company to ensure that adequate electrical power and communication service is provided to the hotel.

Recreational Resources

The project will improve lateral shoreline access by construction of a concrete pedestrian promenade, extending along the beach fronting the project from the southern boundary to Black Rock. A public beach parking area with 20 spaces, including one handicapped stall, will be constructed adjacent to the Kaanapali Parkway and the public beach access.

Visual Analysis

The proposed action will not generate significant adverse effects to visual or scenic resources from Honoapiilani Highway or up and down the coast. The hotel improvements will maintain the existing low rise, low density ambiance, and make use of natural materials and colors. Increases in building heights are far less than the heights allowed under current zoning.

Socio-Economic Characteristics

The proposed redevelopment will generate an estimated 800 direct, construction-related jobs as well as short-term indirect and induced employment. The hotel will be closed to guests during the 12 month renovation period, and during this time, most of the total 388 employees will be temporarily laid off. The hotel will work closely with the unions to provide adequate notification. The existing labor agreement with the union will be extended to provide the necessary reemployment, seniority and retirement benefit protection.
1.7 Determination

Under the provisions of Chapter 200 of Title 11, Hawaii Administrative Rules, prepared by the Department of Health, Section 2-8.3.b, of the SMA Rules and Regulations of the County of Maui, which establish criteria for determining significant impact within the Special Management Area, and the requirements of the Shoreline Setback Rules and Regulations for Maui County, and based on the analysis contained herein, the proposed action will not have any substantial adverse effect on the environment.
II.

Description of Proposed Action, Alternatives Considered and Agencies Consulted in Preparing Assessment
II. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION, ALTERNATIVES
CONSIDERED AND AGENCIES CONSULTED IN PREPARING ASSESSMENT

2.1 Description of Proposed Action

2.1.1 Existing Conditions

The Sheraton Maui Hotel is a 510-guest room hotel located at the Kaanapali Beach Resort, on the west coast of the island of Maui, about three miles north of Lahaina (Figure 1). The Kaanapali Beach Resort is a 1,200-acre master planned resort community conceived in the early 1950's and commenced in 1959 with the construction of a water system, sewage treatment plant, drainage system and a network of roadways. Today, the Kaanapali Beach Resort area includes six hotels with over 3,700 rooms, six residential condominium developments, a shopping center/whaling museum, and two 18-hole golf courses. Approximately half of the 1,200-acre resort is now developed (Figure 2).

The Sheraton Maui Hotel, the first hotel developed at the Kaanapali Beach Resort, is located in the northern, makai end of the resort, and is bordered by the Kaanapali Beach Hotel to the south and the Royal Kaanapali Golf Course to the north and east. The 23.291 acre hotel property is identified as TMK 2nd Division 4-4-08:5, and is owned by Kyo-ya Company, Ltd. (Figure 3). A large lava rock outcropping at the northern end of the property, commonly known as Black Rock, is the most prominent feature along the Kaanapali Beach shoreline, rising abruptly to an elevation of 78 feet.

The original hotel, constructed in the early 1960's, included a lobby and dining room at the top of Black Rock, and the Cliff Tower of guest rooms against the side of the rock. Subsequent additions to the hotel added additional guest facilities and the lower lobby. Existing guest room facilities include: the six-story Cliff Tower, the six-story Garden Tower, the three-story Molokai Wing (on Black Rock) and two-story guest cottages spread throughout the southern, central and mauka portions of the site. In addition, the hotel has two main dining facilities, the Discovery Room restaurant at the top of Black Rock and the Ocean Terrace coffee shop near the Cliff Tower swimming pool (Figure 4).
There is a rocky landing, often referred to as the "old pier", at the northern end of the site. This landing was formerly used to ship out the sugar that was processed at the Lahaina Mill and hauled to the landing by train. The pier was also used to load cattle for shipment to slaughter. Property records indicate that a portion of the pier is owned by the applicant, with the remainder owned by Amfac/JMB Hawaii, Inc., the adjacent landowner. The pier is currently not in use, and has been fenced off to pedestrians. The old pier is included in this application for SMP approval.

2.1.2 Proposed Redevelopment Plan

The proposed redevelopment of the Sheraton Maui Hotel is intended to modernize and upgrade the existing facilities, enabling the hotel to be more competitive and to increase its overall marketability. Facilities will be upgraded to meet new federal, State and County code requirements, including the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, and to operate more efficiently. Both the aesthetic and functional aspects of the hotel will be improved as a result of the renovation.

The proposed redevelopment concept plan continues to emphasize the low density character of the property and will not change the existing room count of 510 guest rooms or "keys". Approximately 40 percent of the guest rooms will be rebuilt, and the remaining guest rooms will be completely remodeled. There will be a net increase of approximately 2,000 square feet of dining area with the addition of a new Japanese restaurant. New executive meeting facilities will provide approximately 14,000 square feet of meeting space, compared to about 1,000 square feet at present. The increased meeting space will enable the hotel to attract the growing convention and incentive markets.

Site sections, elevation level plans and building sections for the proposed redevelopment, prepared by project architects Wimberly Allison Tong & Goo, are presented in Appendix A.

The redevelopment project is planned to commence in mid-1994 and is expected to last about one year with the entire property shut down during the redevelopment period.

The proposed redevelopment plan (Figure 5) includes both renovation of existing facilities and the demolition and construction of new structures and facilities. For purposes of discussion, the improvements will occur in three areas of the property:
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1) South Beach Area (Seaside Village/lobby area)
2) North Beach Area (Garden Tower and Cliff Tower)
3) Black Rock Area (Discovery Room and Molokai Wing)

The proposed improvements in each of these three areas is discussed below and are summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Net Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guest Rooms</td>
<td>240,047</td>
<td>510 keys</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Total keys</td>
<td>510 keys</td>
<td>510 keys</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Room Rest.</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Terrace Rest.</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Court</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Restaurant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Space</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>12,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mig./board rms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Support</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(foyer/prefunction/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toilets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following discussion describes the hotel improvements as proposed in the redevelopment master plan. It should be noted that the master plan presented in this EA represents a maximum build-out or "worst case" scenario from an environmental impact point of view. In reality, future budget constraints may result in some downsizing of facilities (e.g., elimination of additional story to Garden Tower; downsizing health club, meeting rooms, water features, etc.).
South Beach Area

All the existing, two-story wood frame cottages, located in the southern portion of the property, will be demolished. These units will be replaced by the Seaside Village units, a U-shaped wing of guest room buildings five-stories in height. The Seaside Village buildings will be single-loaded with all rooms facing the ocean.

A new main lobby/porte cochere and a gathering area for guest activities will be constructed just makai of the existing lobby and south of the existing Garden Tower. Access to the new lobby will be provided by a new elevated driveway. The two-story lobby area will feature a reception area, cashier, office space, lobby lounge, bar and a Japanese restaurant on the upper level. The lower level will include an entertainment center, food court and swimming pool deck. A new pool bar, putting green, luau area, and beach front promenade will be linked to the lobby through a pedestrian pathway which winds its way around the swimming pool and swimming waterways on the makai and southern portions of the site.

Adjacent to the lobby, the new Village Center will be the major focus for outdoor guest activities. The Village Center will include: retail kiosks, portable food carts, open spaces for informal entertainment, new conference meeting rooms and prefunction spaces, a health spa and tennis courts. These one-story facilities will be located on the upper level of a new parking garage.

In addition, back-of-house improvements along with central mechanical and electrical equipment will be constructed on the mauka edge of the property adjacent to the new parking structure.

North Beach Area

The North Beach area includes the existing Cliff Tower and Garden Tower, both six stories in height. The Cliff Tower, the original hotel’s guest room building, will be completely renovated and will include the addition of a new pitched roof. The makai end of the ground floor of the Cliff Tower will be renovated for guest services including a service bar and snack facilities. The Ocean Terrace outdoor coffee shop located adjacent to the Cliff Tower pool area will be demolished.
The Garden Tower will also be completely renovated. The first floor of guest rooms will be remodeled to accommodate back-of-house facilities. An additional single-loaded partial floor will be added to the structure, increasing the building height from six to seven floors. That partial floor and a new pitched roof will result in a net height increase of about 20 feet to the Garden Tower.

A new one-story, single-loaded "Garden Wing" of guest rooms will be constructed adjacent to and immediately fronting (makai side) both the Cliff Tower and Garden Tower.

The existing back-of-house facilities located mauka of the Cliff Tower will be renovated after major central mechanical and electrical systems are relocated to the new parking structure.

**Black Rock Area**

Presently, the Black Rock level of the property includes the Discovery Room main dining room, the "original lobby" (currently used as a gift shop area), and the Molokai Wing of guest rooms.

Under the proposed plan, the original lobby and Discovery Room restaurant, bar and kitchen will be completely remodeled. The Discovery Room will be approximately the same size as at present. All new furnishings and floor finishes are proposed in the Discovery Room. The existing Lahaina meeting rooms above the kitchen will be demolished.

The old three-story Molokai Wing will be demolished and the wooden structures replaced with new non-combustible guest room buildings approximately within the same building footprint. An additional partial floor of guest rooms will be added to the Molokai Wing, increasing the Molokai Wing to four-stories in height. A new guest corridor will be provided between the beach and Molokai Wing.

A covered pedestrian walkway will connect the Molokai Wing and the Discovery Room, and a special reception lounge is proposed in this area. In addition, a new swimming pool, pool deck and bar is planned in the areas adjacent to the Molokai Wing, at the makai end of Black Rock.
Parking

Guest Parking. A new two-level parking structure for 500 cars will replace the existing guest cottages along the mauka edge of the property. The parking structure will increase the existing 203 parking stalls (some of which will be demolished) to a total of about 600 stalls, bringing the property into conformance with current zoning code parking regulations.

Employee Parking. Employee parking is currently provided off-site at the employee parking area located south of Luigi's Restaurant, at the south end of the Kaanapali Beach Resort. There will be some paid employee parking provided on-site.

Public Beach Parking. A public beach parking lot will be provided along the southern portion of the site off Kaanapali Parkway, adjacent to the public beach access. The proposed lot will have 20 parking spaces, including one handicapped stall. Public beach parking will be free of charge.

2.1.3 Landscaping/Signage/Lighting

The firm of Walters Kimura Motoda has been retained to design the project landscaping, signage and lighting. The following description of the landscape/signage/lighting plan was prepared by Walters Kimura Motoda. Appendix B includes illustrations of recommended signs, lighting fixtures and irrigation details.

(Note: The site plan shown in Figure 6 and in the illustrations by Walters Kimura Motoda in Appendix B represent an earlier version of the redevelopment master plan, which shows a different configuration for Seaside Village. However, the landscaping, signage and lighting concepts illustrated are still applicable to the current plan).

Landscaping

The proposed landscape concept (Figure 6) seeks to create a cohesive landscape design, a more attractive entry feature and better pedestrian circulation throughout the property than exist at present. This will be accomplished in an environment providing a Hawaiian experience, while creating a special place for guests to relax, play and meet other people.
Note: This graphic was based on a previous version of the master plan with a different Seaside Village configuration. However, landscape concepts illustrated are still applicable to the current plan.
Over the years, a wide variety of plants have been added to the original planting plan, leading to a lack of cohesiveness and a sense of disarray. The proposed landscape design will combine existing and new plant material into a plan which will unify the property, creating a stronger, singular image of the hotel.

The landscape design will incorporate as many existing trees and shrubs as possible. Additional plant material will be brought in from nurseries on Maui, Oahu and/or Hawaii. All plants, including the native Hawaiian species, will be plants cultivated for landscaping purposes, and no plants will be taken from the wild.

The landscape palette consists predominantly of native Hawaiian and Polynesian introduced species, with an emphasis on drought-resistant and salt-tolerant plant material. While these plants will provide the framework for the landscaping, tropical plants will be used to add color, texture and fragrance.

The landscape plan for the hotel entry calls for a grove of stately Loulu fan palms with flowering groundcover below to accentuate the entry. A new sign wall will also be located beneath the fan palms, rather than in the grassed median, to highlight the entry.

Medium canopy trees will line the entry drive, then dramatically open up to a large Banyan tree at the porte cochere, providing the visitor with a sense of arrival. More Loulu fan palms ring the drop off area, repeating the visual imagery of the hotel entry.

On the hotel grounds, large lawn areas will provide outdoor function spaces and a sense of openness, while smaller intimate spaces will provide a peaceful, tranquil setting. Theme gardens reflecting Hawaii’s rich botanical heritage will be situated throughout the property. Displays and signage will accompany the plants to explain their historical, ethnobotanical and cultural significance.

Meandering pedestrian paths will link the theme gardens and areas of the property. The proposed beach promenade links the Kaanapali Beach Hotel, to the south, with the Black Rock.

Overall, the landscape design seeks to create a place for people to relax, play and meet others by dividing the property into a series of smaller, people spaces. However, the swimming pool, walkways and plant material will serve to organize the various design elements into a cohesive whole, creating a hotel which provides a truly Hawaiian experience.
Signage

The signage for the Sheraton Maui will include directional, identification and traffic signs. Natural materials such as carved wood and stone will be used to create a feeling of old Hawaii, while Hawaiian design motifs will provide a unifying element and reinforce the Hawaiian experience. The intent of the signage is not only to direct and inform guests and visitors, but to also provide insight into the history and culture of Hawaii.

Hawaiian petroglyphs, appropriate to the subject matter of the individual signs, will be carved into the directional and identification signs. The signs for the theme gardens will feature relief carvings of Hawaiian quilt patterns.

Large ground signs will be supported by a stone wall base, while small ground signs will be hung from traditional Hawaiian "storage racks" which were used to hang calabashes.

Traffic signs will use internationally-recognized symbols and be of sufficient size and quality to ensure public safety.

Appendix B includes the proposed signage plan for the hotel, illustrating recommended sign locations and examples of typical signs.

Lighting Concept

The landscape lighting concept is intended to provide varying light levels throughout the property to evoke specific moods while ensuring the safety and security of hotel guests. Activity areas will be brightly lit to accommodate night functions, while other areas will have more subdued lighting to create a peaceful, relaxing atmosphere. A combination of tiki torches, well lights, accent lights, path lights and moonlighting will be used.

Tiki torches will be used primarily in the luau area and along the edges of the swimming pool. Well lights (located in lawn areas) and accent lights (in groundcover areas) will be used to illuminate the entry sign wall, trees, shrubs and other items of interest. Both will be directed away from observers to prevent direct glare.
Path lights will be located where the tiki torches, well lights and accent lights do not provide adequate ambient light to ensure guest safety and security. For example, path lights will be placed in areas where there are obstacles or stairs.

The illustrations in Appendix B show some examples of the types of lighting fixtures recommended and their proposed locations.

Through proper selection and location of light fixtures, the landscape lighting design will add to the aesthetic enjoyment of the hotel at night, while ensuring safety and security.

2.1.4 Old Pier

The plan for the Sheraton Maui redevelopment includes a long-term development concept for restoration of the old pier, located on the northernmost end of the site. The pier is partially owned by the applicant, and partially owned by Amfac/IMB Hawaii, Inc., the adjacent landowner. The applicant’s portion of the old pier is included in the petition for Special Management Area use permit.

The restored pier could be used as a staging area for recreational and commercial boating activities. Although the owner/applicant would be willing to participate with the State and other landowners in the pier renovation, it does not intend to take the lead on this component of the master plan.

Environmental and Planning Issues

Because there are no detailed plans for renovation of the old pier at this time, this EA does not include a detailed analysis of impacts related to that action. Should renovation of the old pier go forward at a later date, a supplemental environmental assessment may be required. Major issues and potential environmental impacts which may need to be considered include: water quality; marine biology and impacts on endangered species; ocean currents/beach dynamics; impacts to other ocean recreation uses (e.g., scuba, swimming, fishing, etc.); impacts to the adjacent golf course routing; drainage and other infrastructure; public access; traffic impacts; impact on historic resources; compliance with federal, State and County regulatory requirements; and economic feasibility.
Permits and Approvals

Depending on its scope, this project may require a Department of the Army (DA) permit (i.e., Section 404 or Section 10) from the Army Corps of Engineers, which regulates activities in U.S. waters. The Corps of Engineers regulatory activities and responsibilities encompass a number of federal laws and regulations and may require extensive interagency review and approvals.

The following is a preliminary listing of permits and approvals which could be required for redevelopment of the old pier. Actual requirements will depend on the actual scope of the project.

Federal

- Department of the Army (DA), Section 404 and/or Section 10 permits. DA permits may be affected by the laws and regulations listed below. Permit could involve approvals and possibly permits from other federal and/or State agencies (e.g., National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, State Department of Health, Office of State Planning, Department of Land & Natural Resources-Historic Preservation Division, etc.).
  - National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
  - Clean Water Act
  - Endangered Species Act
  - Marine Mammal Protection Act
  - Fish & Wildlife Coordination Act
  - National Historic Preservation Act
  - Coastal Zone Management Act
State

- Chapter 343, HRS, Environmental Assessment. The project may require an environmental assessment pursuant to Chapter 343 HRS, for use of State lands or funds or development within the shoreline setback area.
- Department of Health, Section 402, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (if project includes any discharge into ocean)
- Department of Health, Section 401, Water Quality Certification (required for DA Section 404 permit)
- Office of State Planning, Coastal Zone Management Federal Consistency Review (required with all DA permits)
- Dept. of Land & Natural Resources, Conservation District Use Application (CDUA) (for development within State Conservation District)
- Dept. of Land & Natural Resources, Shoreline Certification

County

- Construction/Building Permits

2.2 Alternatives Considered

2.2.1 No-Action Alternative

The no-action alternative would continue the operation of the hotel in its current condition. This alternative would not allow the hotel owner to upgrade the overall appearance and physical condition of the hotel, nor allow it to meet current County structural design, parking and federal Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

Existing termite damaged wooden structures would continue to deteriorate as well as pose a fire safety hazard. The quality and condition of existing bathrooms, dining facilities, meeting rooms, fixtures and mechanical equipment would limit the hotel's marketability. Facilities would fail to meet current ADA standards and would limit accessibility for handicapped persons.
The outdated mechanical plant would continue to operate inefficiently. Through time, the aging facilities would cause more costly maintenance and upkeep.

Overall, the hotel's competitive market position would suffer and its physical condition would continue to deteriorate, eventually causing a health and safety hazard. A deteriorated facility could also negatively affect the overall desirability and marketability of the Kaanapali Beach Resort area.

2.2.2 Renovation Phasing Alternative

Several alternatives for phasing the hotel renovation were considered. Two different scenarios for phasing the construction in these areas were examined, as well as the proposed "simultaneous phasing" which requires that the hotel be closed to guests.

The proposed hotel improvements were divided into three major geographical areas for construction, with work progressing from one area to the next. In the two phasing scenarios, the major constraint was providing continuous food and beverage service, as well as maintaining a functioning lobby area and administrative services. The phasing scenarios required between 18 and 20 months for construction, compared to 12 months for the proposed option.

Overall, the phasing scenarios were judged to be less desirable than the simultaneous phasing alternative. Ongoing construction activity would subject guests to noise, dust and inconvenience, leaving a negative impression of their visit. A longer construction period would increase dust and noise impacts to adjacent properties, such as the Kaanapali Beach Hotel. Moreover, a longer construction period would result in construction costs between $3 and $4 million higher than with the preferred alternative.

2.3 Consulted Agencies

The following agencies were sent "pre-consultation" packages (with a description of the proposed renovation project) during preparation of the Draft EA as well as copies of completed Draft EA document. Comment letters received during the pre-consultation period are attached as Appendix F. Comments to the Draft EA are attached as Appendix G.
Federal Agencies

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers
*U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service

State Agencies

Department of Health
Department of Land & Natural Resources
Department of Land & Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Division
Department of Transportation
**Department of Accounting and General Services (Survey)
**Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism

Maui County Agencies

Department of Planning
Department of Public Works
Department of Parks and Recreation
Department of Human Concerns
Department of Water Supply
Department of Land Use and Codes
**Maui County Police Department
**Maui County Fire Department

Other

Maui Electric Company

*Agencies sent pre-consultation package only.
**Agencies sent Draft EA only.

In addition to the public agencies listed above, the Sheraton Maui will be meeting with adjacent property owners (e.g., Amfac/IMB Hawaii, Inc., Owners Association of Eldorado Resort Condominium and Kaanapali Beach Hotel) to discuss the proposed project.
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III. RELATIONSHIP OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT TO EXISTING PUBLIC PLANS, POLICIES AND CONTROLS

3.1 Hawaii State Plan

The Hawaii State Plan (Chapter 226 Hawaii Revised Statutes, as amended) establishes a set of guidelines for the statewide planning system, and provides the overall theme, goals, objectives, policies, and priority guidelines. The following describes the purpose of the State Plan.

"...[it] shall serve as a guide for the future long-range development of the State; identify the goals, objectives, policies, and priorities for the State; provide a basis for determining priorities and human resources, land, energy, water, and other resources; improve coordination of federal, state, and county plans, policies, programs, projects, and regulatory activities; and to establish a system for plan formulation and program coordination to provide for an integration of all major state and county activities" (Chapter 226-1: Findings and Purpose, HRS).

The proposed action is basically consistent with the goals, objectives, policies and priority directions of the Hawaii State Plan. The following section analyzes the impacts of the project with respect to four substantive areas of the Hawaii State Plan: the economy, the population, the physical environment and facility systems.

Economy

Relevant objectives and policies in this area focus on the State's economy in general and the visitor industry. Specific objectives include increased employment opportunities, income, and job choice and a visitor industry that constitutes a major component of steady growth for Hawaii's economy.

The proposed action will contribute to the attainment of the economic objectives by creating and retaining permanent jobs within the visitor industry, creating short-term construction jobs and improving the quality of the overall Kaanapali visitor destination area by reinvesting in the existing physical facilities. The project will help maintain the high standard of development set by the existing Kaanapali Beach Resort.
Population

The objective of the population element of the Hawaii State Plan is the guidance of population growth consistent with the physical, economic and social objectives of the Plan. A policy established by the Plan to achieve its population objective is the encouragement of an increase in economic activities and employment opportunities on the neighbor islands consistent with community needs and desires, and to ensure that adequate support services and facilities are provided to accommodate the expansion.

The proposed project will result in direct and indirect jobs and economic opportunities, and by enhancing the quality and competitiveness of the hotel and its facilities, ensure greater job stability for its employees.

Physical Environment

Objectives and policies for the physical environment relate to the enhancement of terrestrial, aquatic, shoreline and marine resources and scenic, aesthetic, and historic resources. Essentially, these objectives seek to encourage the prudent use of Hawaii's natural resources.

The proposed action will not adversely affect natural resources of the area. The hotel renovation will retain the existing guest unit (key) count and low density ambiance. Increases in building heights will be minimal, and far less than the 12-story heights allowed under County zoning. Beach access will be maintained and enhanced through the provision of 20 public beach parking spaces and by construction of a public walkway across the beachfront of the property. Access to Black Rock from the beach area will be maintained.

An archeological inventory survey was conducted within areas proposed for subsurface excavation. The survey did not find any significant cultural deposits or burials.

Because there will be no net increase in hotel keys, and therefore hotel guests, there will be no significant increase in traffic, noise levels, or air pollution, with the exception of temporary, construction-related impacts.
Facility Systems

Relevant objectives and policies for facility systems focus on three areas: solid and liquid wastes; water and transportation. These objectives seek to ensure that adequate infrastructure will be provided to accommodate present residents and future population growth. Because the proposed action will not result in any net increase in hotel room keys, impact on existing infrastructure systems will be minimized. A slight increase in water, wastewater and electrical demand will be accommodated by the existing systems. The additional meeting and restaurant facilities will have a nominal impact on traffic, and no traffic mitigation measures are recommended with the proposed project. These issues are discussed further in Chapter IV.

3.2 State Functional Plans

The Hawaii State Plan directs the appropriate State agencies to prepare functional plans for their respective program areas including: education, employment, health, housing, human service, agriculture, conservation lands, energy, higher education, historic preservation, recreation, tourism, transportation, and water resources development. These functional plans serve as the primary vehicles for the implementation of the goals, objectives and policies of the Hawaii State Plan. The following functional plans were found to have the most relevance to the proposed Sheraton Maui Hotel renovation.

3.2.1 State Tourism Functional Plan

The State Tourism Functional Plan, developed by the Tourism Office of the Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, guides government and private sector implementation of the visitor industry objectives, policies, and Priority Guidelines set forth by the Hawaii State Plan. The State Tourism Functional Plan seeks to achieve "a visitor industry that constitutes a major component of steady growth for Hawaii’s economy," while protecting the quality of life and well-being of the people of Hawaii.

The proposed project will invest capital to upgrade the physical plant of a hotel within the Kaanapali Beach Resort, one of Hawaii's finest resort areas. The proposed development will increase the attractiveness and quality of both the Sheraton Maui and the overall Kaanapali visitor destination area by augmenting its existing high quality development. This will be accomplished without a net increase in hotel rooms (keys), and while maintaining the hotel's low density ambiance.
3.2.2 State Recreation Functional Plan

The State Recreation Functional Plan, prepared and maintained by the State Department of Land and Natural Resources, seeks to: 1) assess present and potential demand and supply of outdoor recreation resources and to guide State and County agencies in acquiring or preserving lands of recreation value; and 2) provide adequate recreation facilities and programs; and 3) to ensure public access to recreation areas.

The proposed action will have a positive effect on the area’s recreational resources. A total of 20 public beach parking spaces will be provided at Kaanapali Parkway, next to the public beach access. The lateral beach walkway from the south will be extended through the Sheraton property, terminating at the base of Black Rock. This will facilitate public access to the beachfront areas of the hotel and to Black Rock.

3.2.3 State Housing Functional Plan

The State Housing Functional Plan (prepared and maintained by the Housing Finance and Development Corporation) is a working tool to guide the State, counties and the private sector in achieving the overall goal that every Hawaii resident will have the opportunity to live in a safe, decent and affordable home. The Plan's implementing actions focus on the following six areas: (1) increasing homeownership; (2) expanding rental housing opportunities; (3) expanding rental opportunities for the elderly and other special need groups; (4) preserving housing stock; (5) designating and acquiring land that is suitable for residential development; and (6) establishing and maintaining a housing information system.

Because there will be no net increase in hotel rooms/keys, the County of Maui has indicated that the project is excluded from the County's affordable housing policies for hotel-related developments.

3.2.4 State Historic Preservation Functional Plan

Prepared and maintained by the State Department of Land and Natural Resources, the State Historic Preservation Functional Plan provides guidelines for the delivery of services and the allocation of resources by State agencies with respect to the preservation of history and the heritage of Hawaii. The Plan's objectives, policies and implementing actions cover the following areas: (1) historic records, artifacts, oral
histories and traditional arts and skills; (2) historic properties; and (3) public information.

As indicated above, a subsurface archaeological inventory survey was conducted to determine the presence of absence of cultural deposits and/or burials. No cultural deposits or burials were found. Archaeological monitoring will be conducted during construction excavation.

One of the goals of the petitioner is to provide a better understanding of the Hawaiian culture to hotel guests and employees. This goal will be incorporated into many facets of the proposed action, including the incorporation of native plant species in the landscaping plan; inclusion of botanical theme gardens with educational displays explaining their historical and cultural significance; and use of traditional artifacts and exhibits in displays on the hotel grounds. A primary focus of the educational and informational efforts will be Puu Kekaa or Black Rock, a State historic site with significant cultural and historical interest. Historic and cultural resources are discussed further in Chapter IV.

3.2.5 State Transportation Functional Plan

The State Transportation Functional Plan (prepared and maintained by the State Department of Transportation) is directed "toward the ultimate development of a balanced, multi-modal statewide transportation system that serves clearly identified social, economic, and environmental objectives." The Plan sets forth separate programs for energy conservation and the statewide airport, highways, and harbors transportation systems.

Honoapiilani Highway is the major arterial in West Maui and was recently widened between Kaanapali and Lahaina. The State Department of Transportation is proposing a mauka by-pass highway which would divert through traffic around Lahaina and Kaanapali, thereby reducing traffic congestion on Honoapiilani Highway.

A traffic impact assessment for the proposed action was conducted by Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. The findings and recommendations of this assessment are discussed further in Chapter IV.
3.3 State Land Use Law

All lands within the State have been placed in one of the four land use districts (Urban, Rural, Agriculture, and Conservation) by the State Land Use Commission (LUC) in accordance with the 1961 State Land Use Law (Chapter 205, HRS). The entire project site is within the State Urban Land Use District. The proposed action is therefore consistent with the State Land Use Law.

3.4 Maui County General Plan

The General Plan of the County of Maui, 1990 Update, was adopted by County ordinance in 1991. The intent of the Maui County General Plan, as expressed in the Maui County Charter (Section 8-8.5), is "to recognize and state the major problems and opportunities concerning the needs and the development of the county and the social, economic and environmental effects of such development to set forth the desired sequence, patterns and characteristics of future development."

The General Plan contains objectives and policies for the County, which provide a framework for future decision making. The objectives and policies cover the following seven areas: population, land use, and the environment; economic activity; housing and urban design; transportation; social infrastructure; government; and Kahoolawe, Molokai and Lanai.

The proposed Sheraton Maui redevelopment supports the General Plan's visitor industry economic objectives of (1) encouraging exceptional and continuing quality in the development of visitor industry facilities; and (2) controlling the development of visitor facilities so that it does not infringe upon the traditional social, economic and environmental values of our community [II B 1-2 Objectives].

Stated policies to accomplish these objectives include: "Limit visitor industry development to those areas identified in the appropriate community plans..." and "Encourage enhancement of existing visitor facilities without substantial increases in room count." The Sheraton Maui is located in the existing Kaanapali Beach Resort area, which has been identified as a primary visitor area in the Community Plan. The proposed redevelopment will upgrade existing facilities with no increase in guest room count.
The project is also consistent with the stated General Plan policies to locate buildings so as to retain scenic vistas and to use local manpower in the construction and operation of facilities.

The actual implementation program for the County General Plan policies are contained in the nine district-specific Community Plans. The subject property falls under the jurisdiction of the Lahaina Community Plan District.

3.5 **Lahaina Community Plan**

The Lahaina Community Plan (1983 as amended), mandated by the Maui County Charter and the Maui County General Plan, establishes a program for implementing the County General Plan within the Lahaina region. It sets the desired sequence, patterns and characteristics of future development in the region, and serves as a guide for decision making until the Year 2000. (The 1983 Lahaina Community Plan is currently in the process of being revised by the County and its community advisory committees.)

Community Plan recommendations cover five major areas: a) socio-economic aspects, b) physical aspects, c) support systems: utilities and facilities, d) support systems: human services, and e) government. A discussion of these recommendation areas with respect to the proposed project follows.

3.5.1 **Socio-Economic Aspects**

The Community Plan recommendations regarding socio-economic aspects encompass economic activity and population. The proposed action will upgrade the physical condition of the existing hotel, although there will be no net increase in guest units (keys). The renovation will enhance the economic viability of the hotel, also contributing to the Kaanapali Resort area’s economic well-being. The project will result in short-term construction employment and additional indirect and induced jobs in other sectors of the economy.

The Lahaina Community Plan Land Use Map (Figure 7) recognizes the Kaanapali Beach Resort area as a major tourist destination, including hotel uses, which will be unchanged by the project.
3.5.2 Physical Aspects

Specific recommendations in the Community Plan regarding the environment include the formulation of a drainage master plan emphasizing land management techniques using natural drainageways and protecting nearshore environments and water quality. The proposed action will not have a significant impact on existing drainage patterns or have an adverse effect on nearshore environment or water quality.

3.5.3 Support Systems: Utilities and Facilities

The Community Plan recommends improvements to the Honoapiilani Highway, the primary thoroughfare through the Lahaina and West Maui area. These include the establishment of turning lanes and coordinated traffic signals, highway widening, and the construction of bikeways and walkways.

With or without the project, intersection improvements are currently needed at the Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection. The traffic impact assessment describes these necessary improvements to increase capacity and reduce existing congestion.

Existing utility systems are able to accommodate the renovated hotel's electrical, water and sewerage demands.

3.5.4 Support Systems: Human Services

The Plan's recommendation regarding human services include improving recreation facilities, health and public safety services, and educational facilities; and providing a variety of housing choices and prices via public and private sector projects to area residents and employees. The project is expected to generate a small increase in County and State revenues, due to the hotel's enhanced marketability overall, and its improved ability to attract a convention-oriented market. These revenues will enhance the ability to provide public support services. In addition, the project will create temporary construction jobs and create indirect and induced employment.
3.6 County Zoning

The project site is zoned H-2 (Hotel), allowing for hotel developments and their accessory uses (Figure 8). The minimum lot area within the H-2 zoning district is 10,000 square feet and the maximum building height is 12 stories. The total ground area occupied by buildings shall not exceed 35 percent and the floor area-lot ratio shall not exceed 150 percent. The minimum side yard spacing is 25 feet for 8-story buildings, with front yard spacing requirements 1/2 the height of buildings, with a minimum of 15 feet. The proposed action is consistent with all zoning standards. The maximum building heights proposed (2, 3 and 4 stories) will be far below the maximum of 12 stories allowed under existing zoning designation.

3.7 Coastal Zone Management/Special Management Area

In an effort by the State of Hawaii to preserve and protect the natural resources of the coastal zones, special controls on development along the shoreline have been implemented, as contained in Chapter 205A, Hawaii Revised Statutes, as amended. Chapter 205A, HRS, as amended, defines the Coastal Zone Management Area to be all the areas of the State of Hawaii, except for forest reserve areas. In addition, Chapter 205A, as amended, contains the general objectives and policies, upon which all counties within the State of Hawaii have structured specific legislation which created Special Management Areas (SMA) for each County.

Maui County has adopted SMA boundaries and Rules and Regulations for the SMA which are consistent with Chapter 205A, as amended. (The Maui County rules are discussed in Section 3.9). The proposed action is defined as development, pursuant to Section 2-5 of the SMA Rules and Regulations for Maui County, and is therefore subject to review under those provisions. In addition, the SMA Rules and Regulations of Maui County require that any development proposed within the SMA boundaries be consistent with the Specific Objectives and Policies of Chapter 205A. These objectives and policies are discussed below.
Recreational Resources

This objective deals with the provision of coastal recreational opportunities to the public. The proposed hotel renovation will not have an adverse impact on coastal resources, nor will it impede existing access to the shoreline. A total of 20 public beach parking spaces will be created near the public beach access road at Kaanapali Parkway. Lateral access along the shoreline fronting the hotel will be enhanced, through construction of a beach promenade along the frontage of the hotel property. Access to the top of Black Rock will be maintained.

Scenic and Open Space Resources

This objective deals with protection and preservation of coastal scenic and open space resources. Visual impacts of the proposed action are described and analyzed in Chapter IV. Based on the visual analysis, the proposed action will not adversely affect the quality of coastal scenic and open space resources. While some structures will be slightly higher than at present, the modifications will be barely noticeable from off-site. Structures will be clustered in groups of smaller buildings rather than a few monolithic structures. Visual impacts will be mitigated further through the use of suitable building materials, color schemes and generous landscaping. Finally, it should be emphasized that the proposed building heights are well below the maximum 12-story heights allowed under existing County zoning.

Economic Uses

This objective attempts to direct public or private facilities to suitable locations. The current use of the site for hotel has been recognized as the most appropriate use by public policy, as embodied in the Maui County General Plan, Lahaina Community Plan and zoning designations.

Coastal Hazards

These objectives seek to reduce hazard to life and property from tsunami, storm waves, stream flooding, erosion and subsidence. The hotel structures proposed for redevelopment and construction are not in the coastal high hazard area. Existing habitable structures near the coastal high hazard area (i.e., luau cottages) will be demolished as a part of this project. The structures on Black Rock are not as vulnerable to tsunami or storm waves because of their elevation above mean sea level.
3.8 Special Management Area Guidelines- Maui County

The Maui County Planning Commission has established a series of guidelines to evaluate developments proposed within the SMA. These guidelines (SMA Rules and Regulations, Section 2-8-3) seek to minimize environmental impact, avoid restrictions upon public access to the coast, minimize adverse visual impacts and impacts to water quality. These guidelines note that "No development shall be approved unless the Authority has found that: (1) the development will not have any substantial environmental or ecological effect...; (2) the development is consistent with the objectives and policies, as enumerated in Chapter 205A, Hawaii Revised Statutes, and as recited herein under Sections 2-8.1 and 2-8.2, above (objectives and policies); and Special Management Area guidelines set forth in this Article; and (3) the development is consistent with the County General Plan, zoning, subdivision and other applicable ordinances." (section 2-8.3(b) (1),(2) and (3).)

According to the County’s significance criteria, a proposed action may have a significant adverse effect on the environment when the action:

(1) involves an irrevocable commitment to loss or destruction of natural or cultural resources. The project will not result in a loss or destruction of natural or cultural resources.

(2) significantly curtails the range of beneficial uses of the environment. The project will actually increase beneficial uses of the environment by enhancing pedestrian access along the beachfront and by providing public beach parking.

(3) conflicts with the County’s or the State’s long-term environmental policies or goals. The project is consistent with public environmental policies and goals.

(4) substantially affects the economic or social welfare and activities of the community, County or State. The redevelopment will generate an estimated 800 construction-related jobs and additional indirect and induced employment. The hotel will work closely with the unions to mitigate the impacts of temporary layoffs during the construction period.

(5) involves substantial secondary impacts. Because there will be no increase in total guest units, the project will not have substantial impacts on public facilities and infrastructure.
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(6) cumulatively has considerable effect upon the environment or involves a commitment for larger actions. Because it involves redevelopment of an existing hotel within an existing resort area (Kaanapali Beach Resort), the project will not contribute to cumulative impacts on the environment or involve a commitment for larger actions.

(7) substantially affects a rare, threatened or endangered species of plant or animal or its habitat. The action will renovate and upgrade an existing, currently developed site. It will not impact any rare, threatened or endangered species or its habitat.

(8) substantially and adversely affects air or water quality or ambient noise levels. The redeveloped hotel will have the same number of guest units, and therefore guests, as the existing facility. No significant impacts on air or water quality or increases in ambient noise levels are anticipated. Temporary construction-related increases in dust and noise will be mitigated.

(9) substantially affects an environmentally sensitive area. All new structures in the flat, southern portion of the site will be built outside of the 150-foot shoreline setback area. Structures on Black Rock will be setback at least 40 feet from the shoreline and are not as vulnerable to coastal flooding because of the existing elevation.

(10) substantially alters natural land forms and existing public views to and along the shoreline. The proposed improvements will have minimal impacts to public views to and along the shoreline. Proposed building heights are far below allowable heights under County zoning regulations.

Based on the above criteria and discussion, the proposed action will not have any substantial or ecological effect on the environment and is consistent with the objectives and policies of Chapter 205A, Hawaii Revised Statutes, the County General Plan, zoning, subdivision and other applicable ordinances. Accordingly, the project is consistent with the Maui Planning Commission's SMA Guidelines.
3.9 Shoreline Setback Rules and Regulations

History

In an attempt to protect the shoreline from the intrusion of development which could alter natural beach and shoreline processes, the State Legislature created provisions to control development within an area referred to as the Shoreline Setback area (Chapter 205A, Part III, HRS). When the Legislature first adopted laws governing the shoreline setback area in 1970, County planning commissions were given the authority to set the shoreline setback line between 20 and 40 feet. Accordingly, the Maui County Planning Commission originally fixed the shoreline setback at 40 feet (unless the subject parcel qualified for a 20-foot setback as the result of limited lot depth).

In September 1990, the Shoreline Setback Rules and Regulations were revised, increasing the shoreline setback for the area from 40-feet to 150-feet from the certified shoreline (Chapter 5 Rules of the Maui County Planning Commission Relating to the Shoreline Area of the Islands of Kahoolawe, Lanai and Maui, September 1990).

The construction of the Sheraton Maui Hotel commenced prior to the first 1970 shoreline setback regulations. Presently, portions of the existing hotel structures encroach into the 150-foot setback area (although all existing structures are at least 40-foot from the certified shoreline). These include some of the beach cottages, a portion of the Cliff Tower, and the Discovery Room and Molokai Wing located on Black Rock. Because these structures were approved and constructed prior to the September 1990 effective date of the new requirements, they are considered non-conforming structures within the 150-foot shoreline setback.

No new development or major redevelopment is permitted within the 150-foot setback area unless it is specifically exempted in the setback rules (i.e., minor structures or renovation not exceeding 50 percent of assessed value, etc.), or a variance is obtained from the Maui County Planning Commission.

Criteria for judging the appropriateness of a setback variance request include: a determination that the proposed action will not adversely affect beach processes or artificially fix the shoreline, provided it is found that the applicant would experience hardship if the request is denied; maintaining safe lateral access to and along the shoreline; and minimizing adverse impacts to public views to, from and along the shoreline.

III-15
Requested Shoreline Setback Variance

A shoreline setback variance is being requested for non-exempted uses within the 150-foot setback (Figure 9).

For discussion of the requested shoreline setback variance, the Sheraton Maui property can be divided into two areas: 1) the beach area of the property, to the south and 2) the Black Rock area to the north.

Beach Area of Property (South). The beach area or southern portion of the property is fairly level and constitutes the majority of the site. This area includes the Cliff Tower, Garden Tower and existing luau cottages. In an effort to meet the intent of the 1990 Shoreline Setback Rules and Regulations, no new habitable structures have been sited within the 150-foot setback. Most existing non-conforming structures, such as the luau guest cottages, will be demolished.

However, the seaward wing of the existing Cliff Tower, which will be significantly renovated, is within the 150-foot setback and will require a shoreline setback variance. Other uses planned for the area include the beachfront promenade, an open lawn which could be used as a luau area and pool bar. These are considered to be minor structures and therefore exempt from the variance requirement.

Black Rock Area (North). Black Rock is an elevated, rocky peninsula, which juts out into the ocean at the northern end of the Sheraton property. Structures on Black Rock are situated at elevations from 30 to 70 feet above msl.

At Black Rock, the project proposes to renovate the Discovery Room dining facility, to demolish the existing Molokai Wing and construct a new Molokai Wing within approximately the same building footprint, and to construct a new swimming pool area. Because of its physical configuration (surrounded on three sides by ocean), most of Black Rock is within the 150-foot shoreline setback. As such, a shoreline setback variance is required for the Discovery Room and Molokai Wing improvements. The proposed swimming pool is considered a minor structure and is therefore exempt.

Several factors should be taken into consideration in evaluating the requested shoreline setback variance. First, given the unique physical configuration of Black Rock, a literal interpretation of the 150-foot setback (150-feet from all three ocean-facing sides) would result in virtually no buildable land on the peninsula, as indicated in Figure 9.
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Secondly, the County’s Shoreline Setback rules provide for exceptions to the 150-foot setback, e.g., for shallow lots or where application of the regulations would reduce buildable area to less than 50 percent of the lot. These provisions could only be applied to Black Rock if it were subdivided and constituted as a separate lot. Because it is now part of a larger lot, a strict, literal interpretation of the 150-foot setback would eliminates any reasonable use of the Black Rock area.

Finally, because of its physical and geological characteristics, Black Rock is not as vulnerable to coastal storm hazard or beach erosion as most beachfront areas. The proposed improvements will have no effect on beach processes, with the structures closest to the ocean (Molokai Wing) all at least 30 feet above msl, and at least 40 feet from the certified shoreline. Being a rocky outcrop, there is no sandy beachfront at Black Rock.

Safe lateral access to Black Rock from the beach will be maintained, although public access around Black Rock is not provided because of the danger posed by the sheer cliffs along the north side. The proposed structures would not adversely impact public views to, from or along the shoreline, as discussed further in Chapter IV.

**Summary**

The proposed uses on the property will not adversely affect beach processes, artificially fix the shoreline or interfere with lateral shoreline access. Nor will they have adverse impacts on public views.

In the southern portion of the property, there will be no new habitable structures within the 150-foot setback, with the exception of the redeveloped Cliff Tower wing. Most of the existing non-conforming structures will be demolished. A beachfront promenade will be constructed, enhancing lateral shoreline access and public views.

The unique physical layout and geological characteristics of Black Rock merit special consideration of the 150-foot setback. All proposed structures are sited within the same building footprint as the existing structures; at a minimum elevation of at 40 feet above msl, and setback at least 40 feet from the certified shoreline.
The overall Sheraton Maui redevelopment meets the spirit of the shoreline setback law, and is consistent with the County's General Plan policy to renovate existing hotels with no net increase in guest units. Finally, the applicant would suffer hardship if the request is denied, as it would be forced to demolish hotel facilities which have been a popular, notable feature of the Kaanapali Beach Resort for nearly 30 years.
IV.
Description of the Affected Environment, Potential Impacts and Mitigating Measures.
IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATING MEASURES

4.1 Climate

Existing Conditions

The project area is located on the dry leeward coast of West Maui, in the Lahaina Judicial District. The average annual rainfall in the area is between 15 to 18 inches. The average annual temperature in the nearby Lahaina area ranges from 71.5 degrees to 78 degrees Fahrenheit Tradewinds blow from the northeast. (1989 State Data Book).

Probable Impacts

The project is not expected to have any significant impact on the regional climate. The property is already generously landscaped, and the proposed modifications to the landscaping will have minimal impact on micro-climate conditions on the site.

4.2 Geography/Soils

Existing Conditions

The southern portion of the project site is fairly level, with elevations averaging from 10 to 12 feet above mean sea level (msl) throughout the majority of the property. The predominant geographical feature on the site is Puu Keaka, a volcanic cinder and spatter cone which forms a large rock outcropping at the northernmost end of the site. Puu Keaka is commonly referred to as "Black Rock". The hotel's Molokai Wing and Discovery Room structures are located at the top of Black Rock, whose cliffs rise spectacularly from the ocean. The elevations at the top of Black Rock range between 40 to 70 feet above msl, reaching 73 feet above msl at the Discovery Room. A view from the top of Black Rock affords a spectacular vantage point up and down the Kaanapali coastline, of the West Maui mountains and the surrounding Kaanapali areas.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service (SCS) Soil Survey of the Islands of Kauai, Oahu, Molokai and Lanai, the soil on the level areas of the project site is classified as Jaucas sand (JaC), a single-grain sandy soil characterized by slopes of 0 to 15%, rarely exceeding 7%. The permeability of this soil is rapid and runoff is very slow to slow. Water erosion hazard is slight.
Potential Impacts

Much of the proposed construction activity, such as the new Molokai Wing, will take place within the building footprint of the existing structures. As such, there will be minimal impact to the area soils or geography. Short term impacts to the site's soils will result during land grading and construction activity.

The proposed grading plan will require excavation and embankment for the construction of the parking structure, the Seaside Village, entry to the new lobby and the additional swimming pools and lagoons. The site will be graded to dispose of the on-site storm runoff generated from the redevelopment.

Small quantities of fill material will be used in the proposed Seaside Village area to facilitate site drainage. The new lobby entry area will also be on fill material.

Mitigation Measures

Erosion control techniques as required by State and County agencies will be followed during all on and off-site work and during the construction phase to minimize soil loss. Graded areas will be hydromulched and watered for dust control.

4.3 Natural Hazards

Existing Conditions

The parcel is not susceptible to earthquake or flooding. The island of Maui is classified as Zone 2 on the Seismic Risk Map of the United States for the purpose of structural design. This classification system is based on a scale of Zones 0 to 4, with Zone 4 having the highest seismic occurrence and danger. All structures built will conform to the County Building Code for Zone 2.
The Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) flood insurance rate maps (FIRM) indicate that the site lies within Zones C, A-4 and V-12. The majority of the site, including all of the Black Rock area, is within Zone C, areas of minimal flooding. Areas along the shoreline are close to zone A-4, the 100-year flood zone. The base flood elevation in the A-4 zone is eight feet above msl. The canal on the northern end of the property is situated in Zone V-12, an area of 100-year flood with velocity (wave action).

The Maui County Council recently passed a bill revising the County's flood district ordinance in line with new FEMA regulations. The new "Ordinance Amending Chapter 19.62 of the Maui County Code Relating to Flood Hazard Districts" was adopted in April 1993. The ordinance requires a Special Flood Hazard Area Development Permit prior to any construction within any special flood hazard area as delineated on the FIRM maps.

Potential Impacts

The proposed project site has minimal susceptibility to natural hazards and the project will have no impact on the occurrence of these hazards.

The project will demolish the beachfront cottages and wooden kiosk currently in the 100-year flood zone (A-4). All new guest room structures (i.e., Seaside Village) will be rebuilt within Zone C.

The project is not affected by the County's new flood district ordinance, since no new structures or existing structures to be renovated are in the flood zone.

Mitigation Measures

All structures will conform to State and County building codes and requirements for seismic Zone 2. All habitable areas of new structures will not intrude into the coastal high hazard zone.
4.4 Archaeological and Historic Resources

An archaeological inventory survey, including subsurface investigation, was conducted in April 1993 by Paul H. Rosendahl, Ph.D. Inc. (PHRI), in consultation with the Department of Land and Natural Resources-State Historic Preservation Division (DLNR-SHPD). The purpose of the survey was to determine the presence or absence of cultural deposits and/or burials. The subsurface investigation focussed on three areas of the site, identified in consultation with DLNR-SHPD. These three areas were selected based on previous archaeological studies and historical information and the fact that some below-grade excavation (no greater than 5 feet in depth) is proposed in the areas.

The PHRI report is included as Appendix C and its findings are summarized below.

Existing Conditions

*Historical Background.* The PHRI report provides a detailed historical account of native Hawaiian settlement and early historic uses within the Lahaina District, as well as a summary of previous archaeological findings within the project vicinity. These accounts describe Lahaina as an important and highly populated region used extensively for agriculture. Lahaina was the capital of the Hawaiian Kingdom from the late 1700s to 1850, when the capital was moved to Honolulu.

There are a number of Hawaiian legends surrounding Puu Kekaa or Black Rock. According to ancient Hawaiian tradition, Puu Kekaa is a *Leina a ka uhane*, or "the leaping place of the soul", where souls of the dead leaped into the next world. This area is listed as a historic site (Site 1206) by the DLNR-SHPD.

The old landing on the north side of Black Rock was constructed to ship out the sugar that was bagged and processed at the mill in Lahaina. The landing was abandoned just prior to World War I.

Sheraton Maui employees who grew up in the area also recall a lumber yard and a cattle holding pen on the site of the present hotel.

Overall, the PHRI study notes that the model of prehistoric settlement and land use generated from previous archaeological research and historical documents suggest that a high density of significant archaeological sites, of great variety, once existed within leeward West Maui in general, and in the project area in particular.
Subsurface Survey Findings

Study Area. Selection of the three areas identified for subsurface investigation was based on consultation with the DLNR-SHPD. The location of the areas is shown in Appendix C. Each of the three are grassy, open lawns adjacent to existing structures. Area 1 is located just makai of and directly in front of the existing Garden Tower. Area 2 is located behind (mauka) of the Garden Tower. Area 3 encompasses the grassy lawn near the luau cottages, at the site of the proposed Seaside Village. The three areas are landscaped with grass and other introduced ornamental species. Although the entire project site supported dense stands of native vegetation in prehistoric and early historic times, extensive development of agriculture and resort complexes have removed virtually all of this cover.

Survey Methodology. The basic objectives of the PHRI survey were a) to identify all sites and site complexes present within the project area; b) to evaluate the potential general significance of all identified archaeological remains; c) to determine the possible impacts of proposed development upon the identified remains; and d) to define the general scope of any subsequent further data collection and/or other mitigation work that might be necessary or appropriate.

The subsurface survey consisted of 15 backhoe trenches, placed in each of the three areas at intervals designed to ensure representative samples. (A description of the trenches and findings are included in Appendix C). Each of the 15 trenches was 5.0 meters in length and 0.75 meters wide (bucket width). Depths varied from 1.71 to 2.90 meters. (The trenches were excavated beyond the anticipated construction depths.)

Findings and Conclusions. The PHRI study found evidence of extensive disturbance of the area, probably during with the construction of the hotel in the 1960's. No prehistoric subsurface cultural deposits, burials or human skeletal remains were identified within the project area. The PHRI report describes the findings and conditions encountered in each of the three areas.

The PHRI report notes that although historic documentation indicated the possible presence of human remains in the project area, no such remains were identified during subsurface testing. Although the Kekaa area has been described as densely populated during the proto-historic period, no prehistoric cultural deposits were noted. Very few, if any, soil deposits in the redevelopment area are intact, most are fill.
Recommendations

In view of the negative findings for the proposed project, the PHRI study concluded that construction and other redevelopment activities will not affect archaeological or historic sites of significance. No further treatment or consideration of archaeological resources is necessary.

The PHRI report has been reviewed by DLNR-SHPD. In a response letter to PHRI dated May 3, 1993 (see Appendix C), DLNR-SHPD noted that it concurred with the report findings. DLNR-SHPD also requested that the report include sections from the backhoe trenches, and these have been included.

As requested by DLNR-SHPD, an archaeologist will be present on site during construction excavation to monitor any findings. If cultural artifacts or burials are discovered at any time during construction, all work will be suspended until a certified archaeologist can determine the significance of the discovery.

4.5 Traffic Circulation

A traffic impact assessment has been prepared for the project by Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas. The report is included as Appendix D. The major findings are summarized below.

Existing Conditions

Existing Roadways. The Sheraton Maui site is located at the northwestern terminus of Kaanapali Parkway within the Kaanapali Beach Resort area. Access to the project site is currently provided through two driveways located on the cul-de-sac at the northwestern terminus of Kaanapali Parkway.

Honoapiilani Highway is the primary link through Central Maui around the southwestern coast of the island. It connects Wailuku in the northeast with Maalaea in the south, Lahaina in the southwest and Kapalua/Napili in the northwest. Honoapiilani Highway is a two-lane highway with limited passing areas between Wailuku and Lahaina. From Lahainaluna Road to Kaanapali Parkway, Honoapiilani Highway widens to four lanes, with two lanes in each direction. North of the intersection with Kaanapali Parkway, Honoapiilani Highway transitions to a two-lane roadway with
paved shoulders at its intersection with Kekaa Drive. Within the study area, the posted speed limit on Honoapiilani Highway is 35 miles per hour.

Kaanapali Parkway, which serves as the primary access to the Kaanapali Beach Resort area, is a two-lane roadway with 28-foot wide lanes and a landscaped center median. It is aligned in a northwest-southeast direction and has a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour. Kaanapali Parkway terminates at a cul-de-sac fronting the Sheraton Maui Hotel. On its southeastern end, Kaanapali parkway intersects Honoapiilani Highway at a signal-controlled cross intersection.

Kekaa Drive serves as a secondary access to the Kaanapali Beach Resort area. It is a two-lane local roadway, generally aligned in a northwest-southeast direction. On its mauka end, Kekaa Drive runs parallel to Honoapiilani Highway and terminates at the entrance to the Eldorado Resort Condominiums. A branch off Kekaa Drive connects to Honoapiilani Highway. On its makai end, Kekaa Drive intersects with Kaanapali Parkway, forming the stop controlled stem of a T-intersection.

Existing Traffic Conditions. Data collected for the 1990 "Kaanapali Beach Hotel Expansion Project Traffic Impact Report" (Parsons et al) indicated that the intersection of Honoapiilani Highway and Kaanapali Parkway operates near capacity during the a.m. peak hour and over capacity during the p.m. peak hour.

The 1990 Kaanapali Beach Hotel study recommended converting the dedicated southbound right-turn lane on Honoapiilani Highway into a shared/through right-turn lane. It also recommended widening the southern leg of Honoapiilani Highway to provide a free right-turn movement from (eastbound) Kaanapali Parkway to (southbound) Honoapiilani Highway. These improvements will improve intersection operations to under capacity conditions during the a.m. peak hour, and to near capacity conditions during the p.m. peak hour.

Base Year 1995 (Without Project). The Parsons Brinckerhoff report looked at base year 1995 conditions, assuming that the Sheraton Maui Hotel was not redeveloped. Even without the project, development in the adjoining communities of Lahaina, Kapalua and Napili would generate additional traffic on Honoapiilani Highway.
In forecasting future conditions, Parsons utilized the 1990 data mentioned above, and applied an annual average growth rate of 4.2 percent. For base year 1995, given existing roadway geometrics, traffic volumes at the Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection would experience over capacity operating conditions during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Modifying the southbound right-turn lane and widening Honoapiilani Highway as described above, will increase capacity and improve intersection operations. The intersection would operate under capacity during the a.m. peak hours, but would continue to operate over capacity during the p.m. peak hours.

**Potential Impacts**

The Sheraton Maui Hotel renovation will not result in any change in the number of guest rooms or "keys". The proposed action will result in an additional restaurant (a net increase of 2,000 square feet) and approximately 18,000 square feet of new executive meeting facilities. For this analysis, the renovation was anticipated to be completed by 1995.

**Restaurant.** The net increase of 2,000 square feet of restaurant space was estimated to generate a total of 2 vehicle trips during the a.m. peak hour and 15 vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour. Since the restaurant will be within the hotel complex, a significant portion of traffic generated is anticipated to be either internal to the hotel (pedestrian) or internal to the Kaanapali Beach Resort area. Only 25 percent of the traffic generated was, therefore, assumed to be vehicular traffic that would enter or exit the Kaanapali Beach Resort area. Therefore, the net increase in vehicular trips resulting from the restaurant was estimated at 1 trip during the a.m. peak hour and 4 trips during the p.m. peak hour.

**Executive Meeting Facilities.** Due to the lack of statistical information on trip generation characteristics of resort meeting rooms, the trip generation estimates were based on information provided by the Sheraton Maui Hotel.

A maximum daily attendance for the meeting space was estimated at 400 persons, with an average attendance of 200 persons per weekday. The meeting area (14,000 SF of meeting space and 4,000 SF foyer) is anticipated to be used less than 50 percent of the time.
The Parsons analysis utilized the maximum attendance of 400, and therefore represents a worst-case scenario. It was assumed that 90 percent of the traffic generated by the meeting facilities would be internal to the Sheraton Maui Hotel or the Kaanapali Beach Resort area. The remaining 10 percent of traffic was estimated to generate 40 vehicular trips during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

**Overall Impacts.** Overall, the proposed renovation is forecast to generate 41 additional vehicle trips during the a.m. peak hour and 44 vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour.

The impact of these additional vehicle trips to the surrounding roadway system was assessed by reevaluating operations at the Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection. The analysis reveals that the existing Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection would continue to experience over-capacity operating conditions during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. With the intersection improvements identified previously, the intersection would operate under capacity during the a.m. peak hour. During the p.m. peak hour, however, the intersection would continue to operate over capacity, *with or without* the Sheraton Maui redevelopment project.

**Mitigation Measures**

The State Department of Transportation proposes to construct a new mauka bypass road as a long-term solution to relieve capacity constraints within this portion of Honoapiilani Highway. The Lahaina bypass road would provide an alternative route around the town of Lahaina between the Kapalua/Napili areas and the areas south of Lahaina. This diversion of traffic off Honoapiilani Highway will significantly improve operating conditions at the Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection by reducing the volume of through traffic that passes through the intersection.

In conclusion, the Sheraton Maui renovation will result in only a nominal increase in traffic volumes, and will increase 1995 volumes through the Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection by two percent or less. As a result of the project's nominal trip generation and because intersection improvements are required with or without the project, no mitigation measures are recommended with the proposed Sheraton Maui redevelopment. Improved traffic operations are anticipated with the construction of the Lahaina bypass road.
4.6 Wastewater System

A Preliminary Engineering Report for the proposed project has been completed by Austin Tsutsumi & Associates. This report included an analysis of sewerage capacity and demand. The entire report is included as Appendix E.

Existing Conditions

Wastewater for the existing Sheraton Maui is carried by one 6-inch and two 8-inch laterals to a 15-inch County sewerline on Kaanapali Parkway. The sewage is conveyed to pump stations located along the Royal Kaanapali Golf Course. It is then pumped up to Sewage Pump Station No. 2, located on the mauka side of Honoapiilani Highway. From Pump Station No. 2, the sewage is conveyed to Sewage Pump Station No. 1 by way of a 20-inch force main and a 27-inch gravity line. From there, it is pumped to the 6.7 million gallons per day (mgd) capacity Lahaina Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) near Honokowai Stream.

The system was originally designed to serve the sewage requirements of future developments in Lahaina, with an Average Daily Flow of 3.2 and Peak Flow capacity of 7.2 mgd.

In the early 1980's, Amfac Property Investment Corp. initiated a 3.5 mgd expansion of the then 3.2 mgd Lahaina STP to accommodate anticipated future growth in Kaanapali. The plant expansion, completed in 1985, increased the total treatment plant capacity to 6.7 mgd. Under an agreement with the County, Amfac funded the plant expansion and dedicated the improvements to the County, while maintaining a 3.16 mgd allocation of the STP capacity, which excludes flows from Kaanapali Hillside and The Masters.

Wastewater for the existing Sheraton Maui Hotel is carried by one 6-inch and two 8-inch laterals, providing service to the luau cottage, central and Black Rock areas, respectively. These three laterals convey the wastewater to a 15-inch County sewerline on Kaanapali Parkway. The sewage is conveyed to pump stations located along the Royal Kaanapali Golf Course and pumped up to Sewage Pump Station No. 2, on the mauka side of Honoapiilani Highway. From there, the sewage is conveyed to Sewage Pump Station No. 1 by way of a 20-inch force main and a 27-inch gravity line. From Pump Station No. 1, the sewage is pumped to the Lahaina Sewage Treatment Plant.

According to the Austin Tsutsumi & Associates study, the existing hotel, at full occupancy, generates 334,800 gpd of wastewater.
Potential Impacts

The proposed redevelopment will generate a total estimated wastewater flow of 336,900 gpd during full occupancy. This represents a nominal increase of 2,100 gpd or about a 0.6 percent increase.

Mitigation Measures

Proposed sewer system improvements will be designed in accordance with the requirements of the State Department of Health and County Department of Public Works. Construction plans and calculations will be submitted to the Department of Public Works for approval.

4.7 Water Supply

The following discussion of project water supply is taken from the Preliminary Engineering Report by Austin Tsutsumi & Associates, Appendix E.

Existing Conditions

The existing water system is owned and operated by Kaanapali Water Corporation, a subsidiary of Amfac Property Investment Corporation. The system provides water for potable use, fire protection and irrigation for developed areas.

The water source is basal groundwater obtained from four deep wells, one at Honokowai and three at Mahinahina. These four wells have a total design capacity of 5.4 million gallons per day (mgd), a current pumping rate of 4.28 mgd, and an unused capacity of 1.12 mgd. Two Hanakaoo wells and another Honokowai well will provide an additional 2.52 mgd and are expected to be operational within the next two years.

Water is stored in three 1.5 mg reservoirs. The Puukolii and Kaanapali Reservoirs are located at the mauka end of Puukolii Road. The third reservoir is located mauka of the South Course of the Royal Kaanapali Golf Course.
Transmission is via 12-inch and larger lines between the wells and reservoirs and from the reservoirs to each of the developed areas at Kaanapali. A 16-inch and 12-inch pipeline cross Honoapiilani Highway to service the Kaanapali Resort area. The Sheraton Maui Hotel is serviced via a 12-inch pipeline along Kaanapali Parkway.

Existing water consumption at full occupancy is 353,100 gallons per day (gpd). Approximately 123,000 gpd of water is used for landscape irrigation and swimming pools. The average daily demand for the existing hotel is 450 gpd per occupied guest room.

Potential Impacts

The total estimated average daily demand for the renovated hotel, at full occupancy, is 355,100 gpd. This represents a nominal increase of 1,000 gpd over existing usage, or about a 0.5 percent increase. The proposed redevelopment will maintain the 510 guest rooms with a total estimated domestic flow of 230,900 gpd. The landscape area will decrease, while the swimming pool and lagoon area will increase for a total estimated non-domestic flow of 124,200 gpd.

Mitigation Measures

Water systems will be designed in accordance with the requirements of the County Department of Water Supply, Department of Public Works and the State Department of Health.

4.8 Drainage

The Austin Tsutsumi & Associates report included the following assessment of the existing and proposed drainage system.

Existing Conditions

At present, storm runoff generated from the existing hotel flows in several directions. Over half of the storm runoff sheet flows into the ocean. Storm runoff at the cottages on the southern portion of the property percolates into low spots at the grassed area. Runoff from the parking area, tennis courts, porte cochere and service entry road are intercepted by an underground drainage collection system on Kaanapali Parkway. This underground drainage system discharges storm runoff into the canal at the northern end.
of the property through a 42-inch outlet. The existing hotel generates a total of 78 cubic feet per second (cfs) of storm runoff.

Potential Impacts

The proposed drainage plan will consist of an underground drainage collection system which will convey on-site runoff to the existing system on Kaanapali Parkway. Storm runoff from the Black Rock area and the shoreline area will flow into the ocean and canal. Storm runoff from the new lobby, Seaside Village and the parking structure will be collected by an on-site underground drainage collection system which will be intercepted by the drainage system at Kaanapali Parkway. The storm runoff for the renovated hotel site is projected at 88 cfs. There will be an approximately 10 percent increase in impervious ground area with less open space. The increased storm runoff of 10 cfs should not pose a water quality problem to the north of Black Rock. (Appendix E includes site drainage calculations).

Mitigation Measures

The proposed grading and drainage plans for the project will be designed to produce no adverse impacts by storm runoff on adjacent properties. All drainage improvements will conform to County standards and will be coordinated with the County of Maui Department of Public Works.

4.9 Electrical Power and Communication Systems

Existing Conditions

Electrical. The power system at the Sheraton Maui is supplied by Maui Electric Company and is configured with two 480 volt transformer infeeds. While this system is adequate to handle the loads, its age prohibits the buying of replacement parts and breakers. The emergency system is presently under modification to provide more and more reliable backup to essential loads.

Telephone. The telephone system is tied to the Hawaiian Telephone Company system via a Sheraton-owned Stromberg-Carlson 800 switch. This switch is aged and inadequate for present functions. The plant cabling and inside wiring are badly deteriorated and in need of replacement.
Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The proposed renovation will upgrade the existing power, lighting and communications system, allowing the hotel to meet new and ever increasing code requirements regarding life safety, disability and energy efficiency. A new 200 kW generator which was recently installed to replace two existing generators rated 40 and 35 kW will be reinstalled in the new hotel to provide back-up generation in case of Maui Electric Company failure.

According to Douglas V. MacMahon, Ltd., consulting electrical engineers for the project, electrical energy consumption at the Sheraton Maui is seasonal and a function of weather and occupancy. Although the key count of 510 will remain the same, additional public spaces utilizing air conditioning will increase the overall energy consumption. This increase will be partially offset by the use of stringent energy control and more efficient air conditioning and lighting than exist at present. Although water features will be a prominent visual attraction, the elaborate and extensive use of features with large flow volumes, high heads and high energy requirements is not envisioned for this site.

Douglas V. MacMahon, Ltd. estimates the present demand of 2 kW per room should increase to not more than 3 kW per room, and the monthly average load factor of 550 kWh/kW will remain constant. A peak load of approximately 1,500 kW with about 825,000 kWh per month is expected. Power factor will remain the same at near 100 percent. Present plans call for retention of primary metering with installation of a new double-ended 1,000/1,288 kVA secondary substation with low loss windings. Primary breakers connected to Maui Electric Company will be vacuum type breakers or reclosers with electronic protective relays.

In summary, the added requirements of ballroom and meeting rooms, shops, restaurants and water features, as well as bringing the undersized chiller plant to required tonnages will increase overall energy consumption. However, the replacement of outdated mechanical systems with state-of-the-art systems will increase overall energy efficiency on a per-ton basis.
Maui Electric Company, Ltd. has been notified of the proposed renovation, and the project’s electrical subconsultant will be meeting with representatives from Maui Electric to discuss the anticipated electrical requirements. The applicant will continue to work closely with both Maui Electric Company and Hawaiian Telephone Company to ensure that adequate electrical power and communication service is provided to the hotel.

4.10 Solid Waste

Solid waste is currently disposed at the Central Maui landfill, near Puunene, about 30 miles from Lahaina. This Integrated Solid Waste Management Facility was opened several years ago to replace the Olowalu landfill south of Lahaina and the Makani landfill which had reached capacity. The 55-acre Central Maui facility is expected to be adequate for another 8 to 10 years. The County currently has a request before the Governor for a 100-acre, State-owned site in Central Maui. This proposed Integrated Solid Waste Management Facility will include a baseyard, composting and diversion activities. (Personal communication with Dave Wissmar, Department of Public Works, Solid Waste Division). All non-hazardous construction wastes will be disposed of at the landfill.

4.11 Police, Fire and Emergency Services

Existing Conditions

Police Protection. Service to the Kaanapali area is provided by the Lahaina Police Station, located at Wahikuli. The facility was built in the early 1970’s. The Lahaina District presently includes one Captain, one Lieutenant, six Sergeants and 34 officers in the Uniform Patrol. In addition to uniformed officers, the Lahaina Station includes a Criminal Investigation Division, Vice Division, Juvenile Division, bicycle patrol and crime reduction unit.

There are plans to renovate the Lahaina Police Station and long-term plans for station expansion. (Personal communication, Assistant Chief Charles Hall).

IV-15
Fire Protection. Fire protection service for the Lahaina District are provided by the Lahaina Fire Station in the Lahaina Civic and Recreation Center. The facility, like the police station, was built in the early 1970's. Five firefighters are assigned to a triple combination, 1,250 gpm pumper truck, and four firefighters assigned to a 75-foot ladder truck/pumper with a 1,500 gpm pump capacity and a 300 gallon water carrying capacity.

The Lahaina Fire Station serves the area from Lahaina to Honokowai Stream (including the Kaanapali Beach Resort). A new fire station at Napili was constructed in November 1991. This privately-funded station has a triple combination, 1,500 gpm pumper truck and five firefighters, twenty-four hours per day. With the addition of the new Napili station, the West Maui area now has sufficient fire fighting capacity.

Medical/Emergency Facilities. The Lahaina-Kaanapali area is served by two medical clinics: the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan's Lahaina Clinic and the Maui Medical Group, Inc., Lahaina Branch, as well as a number of private medical and dental care providers. The Kaiser Clinic services participants of the Kaiser Health Plan only. Maui Medical Group's Lahaina Branch is a branch office of the group's Wailuku facility. Both the Kaiser Clinic and the Maui Medical Group Clinic rely on the Maui Memorial Hospital in Wailuku for major surgery, illness and emergency service. Maui Memorial Hospital, a state-owned facility, is Maui's only hospital.

Maui Memorial Hospital contains sufficient space to accommodate health care needs through the year 2000. Existing hospital facilities, medical clinics, private physicians and dentists are adequate to service the proposed development. As such, no mitigation measures related to medical facilities is required. (Kaanapali Beach Hotel EA, September 1990).

Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Because the proposed Sheraton Maui renovation will not result in an increase in hotel keys, there will be little or no increase in demand for police, fire or medical/emergency services.
The renovation will actually decrease fire hazard at the hotel by demolishing existing aging wooden structures and replacing them with non-combustible structures. All improvements are being designed in accordance with all Federal, State, and County fire safety regulations, including emergency and fire access ways, water transmission and hydrants, fire sprinklers, etc. Many of these regulations are not met under existing conditions.

4.12 Recreational Resources

Existing Conditions

West Maui Area. The West Maui area has an abundance of coastal recreational areas, including 17 County parks and three State beach parks: Launiupoko, Wahikuli and Papalaua. About one-third of the County parks are located along the shoreline, including Honokowai and Fleming’s Beach, to the north. Table 2 lists the beaches within a five mile radius of the project, as well as the available public facilities and popular activities at those beaches.
Table 2:
WEST MAUI BEACHES, ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beach</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Public Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sw</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puamana Beach Park</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahaina Beach</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puunooa Beach</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahikuli State Wayside Park</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanakaoo Beach</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaanapali Beach</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honokowai Beach Park</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahana Beach</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keonenui Beach</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaeloa Beach</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honokeana</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napili Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapalua Beach</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneloa Beach</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.T. Fleming Beach Park</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honokohau Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sw=swimming; sn=snorkeling; su=surfing; bs=body surfing; cs=comfort station; pe=picnic equipment; pp=paved parking


In addition to the facilities listed in the table, there is a new privately-owned beach park just north of the Kaanapali Beach Resort area, near the old Kaanapali Airport site. The Kahekilli Beach Park is owned by the North Beach Joint Venture, but is open to the public and will eventually be dedicated to the County. The three acre park has a picnic pavilion, restrooms, showers, picnic areas and parking for 100 vehicles.
Sheraton Maui area. The beaches located on either side of Black Rock are white sand beaches ideal for swimming, diving and snorkeling.

There is a public beach access (from Kaanapali Parkway) along the southern boundary of the Sheraton Maui, between the hotel and the adjacent Kaanapali Beach Hotel. Lateral access along the Kaanapali Beach Resort shoreline is provided by a concrete sidewalk, currently extending from the Hyatt Regency Maui Hotel to the south, and terminating at the beach access on the south side of the Sheraton Maui. From that point, pedestrian access to Black Rock is along the sandy beach, or through the hotel’s garden pathways. The proposed Sheraton Maui redevelopment will extend the concrete sidewalk from the existing terminus fronting the Kaanapali Beach Hotel to the base of Black Rock. A stairway leads from the beach front near the Cliff Tower up to the tip of Black Rock.

From the north, lateral access along the shore is also provided by a concrete sidewalk which terminates at the base of Black Rock on the north end of the Sheraton property. There is no public access walk around the perimeter of Black Rock. From the north side, access to the beach area fronting the hotel is through the central area of the hotel property.

Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The proposed improvements will not have any adverse impacts on coastal recreational resources. The project will enhance lateral beach access fronting the Sheraton Maui by extending the public walkway from the south side of the property near Kaanapali Beach Hotel to the base of Black Rock. Consideration was given to continuing access completely around Black Rock to the north side of the property. However, this option was eliminated due to the sheer cliffs and potential public safety concerns.

A public parking area next to the public beach access at Kaanapali Parkway will be constructed. There is no public parking lot at present. A total of 20 parking spaces, including one handicapped stall, will be provided free of charge. The hotel will have additional parking for 500 or more cars which beach goers will be able to utilize. However, this overflow capacity will be rated parking.
4.13 Air Quality

Existing Conditions

Air quality in the project area is affected by a number of sources including agricultural activities such as sugar cane burning, bagasse and fossil fuel burning, and pesticide spraying at the adjacent Royal Kaanapali Golf Courses. Traffic generated by nearby resort traffic also impacts local air quality.

The State Department of Health, Clean Air Branch has an air monitoring site in the Lahaina area, located at the Lahaina Intermediate School. Data from late 1987 to 1990 suggests that State and federal standards for inhalable particulates are being met. However, it should be noted that the principal automotive pollutants, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and ozone (O3) are not routinely monitored on Maui. (Personal communication with Wendell Sano, Department of Health, Clean Air Branch).

Potential Impacts

On-Site. The principal source of short-term air quality impact will be construction activity. Site preparation and earth moving will create particulate emissions as will building demolition and construction. Approximately 35,000 cubic yards of fill material will be brought onto the site, creating a greater potential for particulate impacts.

Another air quality concern is the possible presence of asbestos in floors, ceilings, walls, boilers or other areas proposed for demolition. The federal National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) provides guidelines applicable for any construction project involving demolition. An asbestos survey should be conducted during the design phase of the project to determine the presence, locations and estimated quantities of asbestos, if any. If asbestos is present, NESHAP sets procedures for 1) written notification (of State Department of Health and Environmental Protection Agency); 2) compliance with emission control procedures during construction; and 3) proper disposal. If no asbestos is found, only notification of the Department of Health and Environmental Protection Agency is required. (Personal communication with Tom Lileiks, Department of Health, Clean Air Branch).
The proposed 500-stall parking structure will also be a source of concentrated automobile emissions. The design of the structure must incorporate adequate ventilation to maintain adequate interior air quality.

**Off-Site.** In addition to on-site impacts, there will be limited off-site impacts due to the operation of concrete and asphalt concrete batching plants needed for construction.

Mobile source air quality impacts are created by vehicular traffic. Because the proposed Sheraton Maui renovation will not result in an increased number of keys, no significant increase in vehicular traffic is anticipated. According to a 1990 study done for Amfac/JMB’s South Beach Mauka development, the potential for exceeding the State 1-hour and federal 8-hour standards already exists at the Kaanapali Parkway intersection during the p.m. peak traffic hour under “worst case” meteorology. However, the study notes that CO levels at both intersections will tend to decline over the 1990-1996 period, due to the offsetting effect of the federal motor vehicle emissions control program.

**Mitigation Measures**

The presence and estimated quantity of asbestos will be determined during the project design phase. These materials, if present, will be handled and disposed of in accordance with all applicable regulations during demolition and construction. All Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards to protect construction workers from exposure to asbestos and other potentially hazardous materials will be followed.

There is a significant potential for construction related fugitive dust, particularly with the importation of fill material for the Seaside Village and lobby entry areas. Adequate dust control measures will be employed during construction to mitigate these impacts. Dust control could be accomplished through frequent watering of unpaved roads and exposed soil. Construction vehicle movement should be restricted to off-peak hours as much as possible, so as not to impact the highway level of service (LOS).

Regarding off-site vehicular-related impacts, it appears that federal carbon monoxide standards will be met with or without the project. However, State standards may already be exceeded in close proximity to major intersections serving the project during peak hours. Despite the effect of federal emissions standards for new motor vehicles, continued exceeding of State standards appears possible through 1996.
4.14 Noise

Existing Conditions

Depending on one's location on the property, ambient noise consists of noise from wind, surf and passing vehicles along Kaanapali Parkway. Aircraft noise sources are associated with operations at the Kapalua Airport and in-transit aircraft flying to and from Kahului Airport at high altitude.

Potential Impacts

Because the number of keys, and therefore hotel guests, will remain relatively unchanged after the renovation, there should not be a noticeable increase in noise generated by hotel activities. Due to the marginal increase in traffic related to the project, there should be no significant long-term increase in vehicular-related noise at the site.

Unavoidable but temporary noise impacts will occur during the construction period. The most obtrusive noise will occur during the initial phases of construction because of the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Any blasting required during construction will be determined by the soils engineer based on further geotechnical evaluation. Any pile driving required will be determined by the structural engineer.

The Sheraton Maui property will be closed during the majority of the construction period, eliminating noise impacts to hotel guests. However, there may be impacts to adjacent properties, including the Kaanapali Beach Hotel located directly south of the Sheraton. The most significant impact will probably be to the Kaanapali Beach Hotel's 3-story Molokai Wing of guest rooms, which is situated parallel to the property line between the two hotels, close to the proposed Seaside Village units.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures to reduce construction noise include the use of quiet equipment and limiting construction to normal working hours, as required under State Department of Health noise regulations.

The fact that the hotel will be closed to guests during the renovation will allow construction work to proceed more efficiently, resulting in a much shorter renovation period. This will mitigate impacts to adjacent property owners.
4.15 Visual Analysis

An evaluation of the visual impact of the proposed Sheraton Maui redevelopment is an important consideration in the Special Management Area Guidelines of Maui County. The intent of these guidelines are to ensure that public views to and along the coast are not impeded, especially those from the coastal highway.

Existing Conditions

Views from the Coastal Highway. Honoapiilani Highway is the primary public arterial through the Kaanapali area, providing access from Lahaina to the south and from Napili and Honokowai to the north. The highway roughly parallels the coast and in the vicinity of the Sheraton Maui, it is located a little over one-quarter mile from the shoreline. The Royal Kaanapali Golf courses and the Maui Eldorado resort condominium are located between the highway and the Sheraton property.

Honoapiilani Highway is considered the major public vantage point for coastal views. Traveling south along the highway, the Sheraton Maui Hotel is visible briefly (looking southwest) as one passes directly mauka of the Royal Lahaina condominiums. The Discovery Room and Lahaina meeting room structures perched atop Black Rock, and portions of the Garden Tower are visible, although the remainder of the property is obscured by coconut palms and other vegetation. The ocean is barely visible from this area, and the shoreline is not visible at all. Looking to the south from this vantage point, the building form of the Whaler condominium is visible over the Royal Kaanapali Golf Course and the roof tops of the Maui Eldorado. Beyond the Whaler, the building forms of the Maui Mariott and the Westin Hotel are also visible, suggesting a continuous line of beachfront resort development to the south of the Sheraton.

As one continues southward on Honoapiilani Highway approaching the Maui Eldorado, a landscaped berm on the side of the highway obscures any view of the resort area. The berm continues until the vicinity of the Nanatomi Restaurant, near the intersection of the highway with Kaanapali Parkway.
Approaching from the south, traveling north on Honoapiilani Highway, the Kaanapali Beach Resort’s hotels are visible from a distance. No single building form dominates this view. As one gets closer to the Kaanapali Parkway intersection, the resort landscaping and the green open space of the Royal Kaanapali Golf Course soften the overall visual impact. Upon reaching the intersection of Honoapiilani Highway and Kaanapali Parkway, the resort disappears behind the berm located on the makai side of the highway.

**Views from Kekaa Drive.** A secondary entrance to the Kaanapali Beach Resort area from Honoapiilani Highway is via Kekaa Drive. After turning onto Kekaa Drive from the highway, views of the golf course appear ahead, with the Sheraton Maui Hotel, Kaanapali Beach Hotel and The Whaler condominium coming into view as one passes the Maui Eldorado Resort. South of the Kaanapali Beach Hotel, ocean views are obstructed by the Westin Hotel and The Whaler. After passing the Amfac/JMB Real Estate Sales Center, Kekaa Drive drops in elevation and the ocean view disappears completely.

**Views from Kaanapali Parkway.** Kaanapali Parkway is the major thoroughfare within the Kaanapali Resort area, originating at Honoapiilani Highway and terminating in front of the Sheraton Maui Hotel. The parkway is richly landscaped with canopy form trees and views of the adjacent Royal Kaanapali Golf Course. Views on the makai (west) side of the parkway are dominated by trees and hedges which soften the presence of the built environment.

**Potential Impacts**

Three elements of the proposed redevelopment have the greatest potential to affect existing views of the site, because they result in increased building heights or will construct buildings in presently undeveloped areas. The three elements include: a) Black Rock/Molokai Wing; b) Garden Tower; and c) Seaside Village.

A "before and after" visual analysis has been conducted for these three areas, comparing existing views with "post-renovation" views. Four locations were selected as vantage points from which to characterize potential impacts. The selected vantage points are: 1) Kahekili Beach Park to the north, looking south to Black Rock; 2) the beachwalk promenade at the Kaanapali Beach Hotel looking north to Black Rock; 3) Honoapiilani Highway looking makai across the property; and 4) the Eldorado Resort condominium, looking makai across the property.
View from Kahekili Beach Park. The photos in Figure 10, taken from Kahekili Beach Park to the north of the property, illustrate the visual impact of the additional (7th) floor added to the Garden Tower and improvements to the Black Rock area. The additional Garden Tower floor will have a minor impact on views of the property, but the building height is still lower than the height of the Whaler Condominium in the background. Views of Black Rock will be modified slightly by the (partial) story added to the Molokai Wing. The Lahaina meeting room above the Discovery Room kitchen will be demolished, which significantly improves the vista.

View from the Kaanapali Beach Hotel. Figure 11 shows the view of Black Rock from the south, as seen from the public promenade near the Kaanapali Beach Hotel. There will be no noticeable change in this view of Black Rock, as the Molokai Wing is not visible from this perspective, and the height of the renovated Discovery Room will be unchanged.

View from Honoapiilani Highway. The photographs in Figure 12 were taken from Honoapiilani Highway looking makai toward the property. From this vantage point, one can see the impact of the additional floor to the six-story Garden Tower. As indicated in the photos, there will be little noticeable difference in the view of the Garden Tower from the highway. The new building height appears especially insignificant when compared to the height of the existing Whaler condominium, at the far left of the photo. Modifications to the Seaside Village are obscured by the stand of tall palm trees to the left of the Garden Tower. Improvements to the Molokai Wing on Black Rock are not visible from this view point. Demolition of the Lahaina meeting rooms will have a positive visual impact.

View from Eldorado Resort Condominium. Figure 13 provides a "before and after" panorama from a second floor unit at the Eldorado Resort condominium (Apt. A-205), looking makai toward the property. At present, the Whaler Condominium (at the far left of the photo) is a prominent visual feature. The rooftop of the Kaanapali Beach Hotel's Molokai Wing (3 stories) is visible to the left of the Sheraton Maui's southern property line. The elevated Garden Tower and Discovery Room at Black Rock can be seen in the right corner of the photo. Because of the density and height of existing vegetation, the southern area of the hotel, as well as the ocean and horizon, are barely visible from this vantage point. However, a clear view of the horizon is available to the right (north) of Black Rock.
In the "proposed" photo, the roof tops of the new two-story lobby and Seaside Village buildings can be seen through the existing foliage. Although the Seaside Village will include structures five-stories in height, its overall visual impact will be minimized because of the density and height of the existing vegetation. The additional floor on the Garden Tower will be visible from this mauka area, but is not expected to be obtrusive. The improvements to the Molokai Wing will not be visible from this vantage point. Unobstructed ocean views are still available to the right of Black Rock and continuing up the coast.

Because of the existing heavy vegetation, existing views of the ocean and of the Sheraton property from this area will not change substantially with the proposed redevelopment. Moreover, when placed in perspective with the Whaler Condominiums to the south, the proposed structures will be non-obtrusive, of low scale and blend in well with the surrounding environment.

Figure 14 illustrates a section detail of the proposed Seaside Village structures in relation to Kaanapali Parkway. Existing building codes require minimum building setbacks of one-half the building height, with a minimum of 15 feet. That is, a five-story, 60-foot high structure, like those at Seaside Village, could be placed as close as 30-feet from Kaanapali Parkway. The proposed structures have been set back over 170 feet from the Parkway, in order to minimize visual impacts from the road.

From Kaanapali Parkway, the existing view of this area is of a thick hedge of shrubs and trees, with very little of the hotel visible. That "wall of vegetation" will remain as the dominant view, even after the Seaside Village is complete.

Mitigation Measures

The hotel improvements and proposed landscaping have been designed to mitigate any negative visual impacts. The renovated hotel will make use of natural elements such as lava rock and other materials which look like natural wood. Multi-story structures will include planters on balconies, allowing vegetation to cascade down the sides of the buildings. Only natural, earth tones will be selected for exterior colors; no bright or reflective colors or finishes will be used. Structures will be sited in clusters of smaller buildings rather than a few than monolithic structures, to maintain a low scale, low density ambiance. A Polynesian architectural style, carried throughout the property will blend in well with the surrounding vegetation.
Figure: 11

View from the Kaanapali Beach Hotel
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Figure: 13

View from Maui Eldorado Resort (Apt. A-205)
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The overall visual appearance of the hotel will be softened by generous landscaping which will continue the native Hawaiian and Polynesian architectural theme. Lagoon-like pools and waterways, waterfalls and pedestrian paths throughout the property will serve to unify the landscaping within the site. As discussed previously in Chapter II and in Appendix B, the landscaping, lighting and signage will complement the hotel architecture to create a relaxed, Hawaiian experience.

Structures will be set back from Kaanapali Parkway to minimize their visual impact from the roadway. From Kaanapali Parkway, the wall of shrubs and trees visible at present would remain unchanged. The overall impression of this area for pedestrians and motorists along Kaanapali Parkway will be a pleasant sense of trees and shrubs.

It should be noted that County zoning designations for the property allow building heights of up to 12 stories. Maximum building heights proposed (5-stories) are less than one-half of the maximum heights allowed. The decision by the applicant to keep building profiles low and to set structures back from the roadway was made in order to create a hotel that blends in harmoniously with the natural environment, and minimizes potential visual impacts within the area.

The proposed improvements are subject to review by the County's Urban Design Review Board and Kaanapali Resort Architectural Advisory Committee.

4.16 Socio-Economic Characteristics

Existing Conditions

Population. Maui County (which includes the islands of Maui, Molokai and Lanai) is the third most populous County in the State. Total resident population of the County grew from 70,847 in 1980 to 100,374 in 1990, nearly a 42 percent increase. During the same period, the de facto population (which includes visitors) increased 60 percent. The District of Lahaina, where the Sheraton Maui is located, is one of the major population centers on the island, with an estimated total of 14,574 as of April 1990. (State of Hawaii Data Book 1991).
Economic Characteristics. Economic growth in Maui County, as in the rest of the State, slowed in 1992. The slowdown in the economy was evident in both tourism and construction, the County's two primary industries. In 1991, 2.3 million tourists visited Maui County, a 2.4% drop from the previous year. Figures for 1992 also fell short of post-Gulf War expectations, due largely to the struggling economies of the mainland U.S. and Japan. However, an effort is underway by public and private sectors toward diversification of the visitor market through expansion of target markets.

In the construction industry, the County's hotel construction moratorium coupled with the decline in the economy contributed to a drop in construction employment. Through May 1992, construction levels had dropped 10.5% from the same period in 1991. In mid-1992, major construction projects in the County included the Maui Community Arts and Cultural Center, a joint effort utilizing federal, State, County and private resources; a 62-unit residential project in Lahaina, a $5.5 million Kahaleakeola Resource Center developed by Maui Catholic Charities; the State Housing Finance and Development Corporation (HFDC) Lahaina Master Planned Community; and several privately-funded residential and mixed use projects which were being planned.

In the agriculture sector, Maui's sugar production in 1991 was down 10% from the previous year, due to decreases at Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Co. (HC&S) and Pioneer Mill Co. The outlook for 1992 was not optimistic at mid-year. HC&S is conducting diversification experiments with sugar by-products, and Pioneer Mill continues its experimental coffee crop. Maui Land and Pine ended 1991 with record high production levels, and the outlook for 1992 also appeared positive.

The newly constructed, $6 million Maui Research and Technology Center (MRTC) will help attract and develop new industries on Maui and create highly skilled job opportunities. Six firms had moved into the facility as of mid-1992. Upcoming projects in the high tech field include construction of a new telescope adjacent to the Haleakala observatory and a $2 million telecommunications building next to MRTC. At the MRTC Park, a 59-acre parcel is being developed as a foreign trade zone, one of five in the State, to promote economic development and international expansion.
A 1992 First Hawaiian Bank publication indicated that if an economic recession comes to the State, Maui County would be the first of the four counties to be affected. This is largely due to the simultaneous downturns in the County’s different sectors: tourism, construction, agriculture and retail. Nevertheless, the report continues, the expansion of high tech and ocean activities are encouraging signs. Furthermore, diversification within the basic industries of tourism and agriculture may help stave off the downward momentum and provide future stability.

**Housing.** A 1989 market study prepared by Locations, Inc. for the State HFDC’s Lahaina Master Planned Community suggested that there is a considerable shortfall of housing units in the West Maui market. This has been caused by a combination of factors, including a rapid increase in population, a rapid increase in household formation as household size decreases; and a lack of new housing units to keep up with demand.

A 1989 Bank of Hawaii report states that although data on rental housing is not available, it is known that rental units at affordable rates are in particularly short supply. Current price levels and rates of increase in housing prices indicate an exceedingly tight housing market.

The same Bank of Hawaii publication indicated that the tight housing market, in turn, has affected the County’s labor market, making recruitment of new employees to Maui more difficult than in the past.

**Potential Impacts**

As discussed above, diversification and expansion of markets within the visitor industry is seen as a positive step in dealing with the recent declines in the tourism sector. Trends appear to indicate that there are structural, more permanent changes occurring in the visitor market. A 1992 First Hawaiian Bank report points to diversification targeted at "the buoyant eastbound market and the relatively untapped European portions of the westbound market".

The proposed Sheraton Maui renovation, while not adding any additional keys, will increase the overall quality and competitiveness of the guest units. This will be enhanced further by additional conference and meeting rooms, upgraded food and beverage facilities and expanded recreational amenities.
Creation of Construction Employment. The proposed renovation will create both direct, construction-related jobs, and indirect employment. The estimated value of the renovation is $100 million (Wimberly Allison Tong & Goo estimate), over a 12 to 14 month period. This would result in approximately 800 construction related jobs as a result of this project (assuming $125,000 per job per year). The majority of these jobs would be in the building trades, with the remainder being administrative, management and professional positions.

Direct employment of construction workers will stimulate additional purchases of goods and services, resulting in indirect and induced employment. The 800 direct construction-related jobs would in turn result in an additional 1,120 indirect and induced short-term jobs. (Personal communication with Dr. Tu Duc Pham, Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, Econometric Research Branch).

Creation of Operational Employment. It is anticipated that post-renovation operational employment will remain relatively unchanged from current levels. The renovated hotel will have the same number of guest rooms. Although there will be additional dining and meeting space created, the positions needed to staff these facilities will be offset, since fewer employees will be needed to maintain the hotel’s upgraded mechanical plant and physical facilities than at present.

Affordable Housing. The County of Maui has an Affordable Housing Policy for Hotel-Related Developments, Maui County Ordinance No. 2093, concerning employee housing requirements for hotel developments. Because the proposed Sheraton Maui renovations will not result in an overall increase in the number of keys, the Planning Department has indicated that the project is excluded from these requirements. Moreover, the Planning Department has indicated that the concept of renovating the hotel while retaining the same number of keys is consistent with the County’s policy not to increase the number of hotel rooms in the Kaanapali area.

Hotel Closure During Construction Period. The proposed schedule for the hotel renovation requires that the hotel be closed to guests during the 12 month renovation period. Several alternatives for construction phasing were investigated, which would have allowed certain areas of the hotel to be open to guests while other areas were being renovated. However, these alternatives were judged to be unsatisfactory when compared to a complete shut down.
Studies on other hotel renovations have indicated that guests who stay on the property while construction and renovation are occurring generally leave with a negative impression of their stay. The inconvenience, noise, dust and limited dining and recreational facilities generally detract from the enjoyment of the hotel. Construction hazards to guests would be an ongoing concern. As a result, many of these visitors will never return to the hotel, even after renovation is completed. The Sheraton Maui prides itself on its loyal, repeat clientele. Overall, it was felt that the negative impacts to guests resulting from construction were best avoided altogether.

Furthermore, because it must take guest needs (e.g., continuous food service) into consideration, construction phasing is usually inefficient and results in a longer construction period. Compared to the anticipated 12 month renovation period, a phased scenario would require between 18 and 20 months. Not only does this result in higher construction costs, it also magnifies the construction period impacts to adjacent property owners, such as the Kaanapali Beach Hotel.

*Temporary Employee Layoffs During Construction.* The major socio-economic consideration as a result of the proposed action is the impact to hotel employees during the one-year renovation period.

According to Sheraton Maui Hotel staff, the hotel currently has a total of 384 employees: 308 full-time, 26 part-time and 50 on-call. About half the employees are male and the other half female, with an average age of approximately 40 years old. The ethnic composition of the hotel staff varies, but the majority are of Filipino ancestry. The average years of service is approximately 11 years, including 123 employees who have over 29 years of service with the hotel. Many of the staff hold at least one other job within the visitor industry.

During the renovation, the hotel will be closed to guests and it is anticipated that all but approximately eight management staff would be laid off. Depending on the contractor's requirements, there could be another 10 to 12 employees retained to do project security work.

According to the Sheraton, it is not known precisely at this time what the workforce requirements of the renovated hotel will be, i.e., number of employees and job classifications. However, it is anticipated to be quite similar to current numbers and classifications.
Mitigation Measures

Of the potential socio-economic impacts discussed above, a discussion of mitigation measures is most appropriate for the issue of temporary employee lay-offs during construction.

During the renovation period, all hotel employees would be considered to be on temporary lay-offs. As such, the Sheraton Maui will extend the existing labor agreement, with the approval of the union to provide the necessary re-employment, seniority and retirement benefit protection. Employees willing to relocate will also be considered for suitable openings that may develop among other Sheraton Hotels in Hawaii.

The Sheraton Maui will be meeting with union representatives to discuss its plans and, in cooperation with the union, will develop a detailed plan to address all human resource issues.
V.
References
V. REFERENCES


Clark, John R.K. **The Beaches of Maui County.** 1980.


Helber Hastert & Kimura, Planners. **Kaanapali Beach Hotel Renovation Environmental Assessment.** September 1990.

________. **South Beach Mauka Environmental Assessment.** Prepared for: Amfac/JMB Hawaii, Inc. June 1990.


Maui, County of. **Lahaina Community Plan.** December 1983.


Personal Communications with:

Assistant Chief Charles Hall, Maui County Police Department

Tom Leleikis, Department of Health, Clean Air Branch

Ruby Mizue, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, Operations Branch

John Naughton, National Marine Fisheries Service

Tu Duc Pham, Department of Business Economic Development and Tourism, Econometric Research Branch

Wendell Sano, Department of Health, Clean Air Branch

Dave Wissmar, Maui County Dept. of Public Works, Solid Waste Division
LOBBY BUILDING SECTION

GARDEN TOWER / PARKING SECTION

Map Prepared by WAT&G

Building Sections

SHERATON MAUI REDEVELOPMENT
SHERATON MAUI

Landscape Design Concept
The unassuming entry, the lack of a cohesive landscape design, the small swimming pools and the poor pedestrian circulation patterns of the Sheraton Maui are all negative factors which detract from what is the prime property at Kaanapali. The landscape design concept seeks to solve these problems, in the context of a Hawaiian experience environment, while complementing the overall goal of creating a special place for people to relax, play and meet other people.

Over the years, a wide variety of plants have been added to the original planting plan creating a sense of disarray. There is a lack of cohesiveness because there is no organization to the planting. The landscape design will solve this problem by combining existing and new plant material into a plan which will unify the entire property, thereby creating a stronger, singular image of the hotel.

The landscape design will incorporate as many existing trees and shrubs as possible. These plants will be protected during the construction/renovation of the hotel. Where this is not possible, the plant material may be relocated to another area of the site. Plant material will also be relocated to group similar plants together for aesthetic purposes. Only those plants which are in a healthy growing condition will be saved; diseased plant material, which cannot be treated, will be removed.

Additional plant material will be brought in from nurseries on Maui, Oahu and/or Hawaii. These plants, including the native Hawaiian species, will be plants cultivated for landscaping purposes; no plants will be taken from the wild.

The landscape plant palette consists predominantly of native Hawaiian and Polynesian introduced plants; an emphasis has also been placed on drought-resistant and salt-tolerant plant material. While these plants will provide the framework for the landscaping, tropical plants will be used to add color, texture, form and fragrance. The result will be a lush, tropical paradise that hotel guests only dreamed of before.

The existing entry is very nondescript; there is no focal point or special planting to distinguish the hotel. In contrast, the proposed landscape plan indicates a grove of stately Loulu Fan Palms with flowering groundcover below to accentuate the entry. A new sign wall will also be located beneath the Fan Palms, instead of in the grassed median strip, to highlight the entry.

Medium canopy trees will line the entry drive creating a lowered overhead plane. This dramatically gives way to the focal point of the entry sequence, a large Banyan Tree at the porte cochere. The Banyan Tree, with its dense canopy and hanging, aerial roots, serves to define the outdoor space and give the feeling of arrival. More Loulu Fan Palms ring the drop-off area, reposing the visual imagery of the hotel entry.
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The design and planning of the property and the site, including the layout of the buildings and the landscape, will be based on the principles of Hawaiian culture and design. The design elements will incorporate traditional Hawaiian motifs and symbols, such as the use of natural materials, the integration of natural elements like water and plants, and the use of traditional Hawaiian colors and patterns.

The site will be divided into several areas, each with its own unique features and functions. The main entrance will be adorned with a large wooden gate, which will serve as a welcoming landmark for visitors. Inside, there will be a central courtyard, which will be a focal point for social gatherings and events. The courtyard will be surrounded by a variety of buildings, each with its own purpose.

The design of the buildings will be inspired by traditional Hawaiian architecture, with sloping roofs and open spaces. The materials used will be natural and sustainable, such as wood and bamboo, which will blend seamlessly with the surrounding landscape.

The site will also include a variety of outdoor activities and events, such as cultural performances and workshops, which will be open to the public. These events will be held in the central courtyard and other open spaces, providing a venue for visitors to experience Hawaiian culture and history. The design of the site will be flexible and adaptable, allowing for the addition of new activities and events as needed.
The signage for the hotel will not only direct and inform hotel guests and visitors, but give insight into the history and culture of Hawaii.

**Landscape Lighting Concept**

The landscape lighting concept is to provide varying light levels throughout the property to evoke specific moods while ensuring the safety and security of hotel guests. Activity areas will be brightly lit to accommodate nighttime functions whereas other areas will have more subdued lighting to create a peaceful, relaxing atmosphere. A combination of tall torches, well lights, accent lights, path lights and moonlighting will be used.

Tall torches will be used primarily in the lagoon area and along the edges of the swimming pool. The reflections of the soft, glowing flames in the water will create the feeling of a romantic, island paradise and encourage moonlit walks through the property.

Well lights and accent lights will be used to up-light the entry sign wall, trees, shrubs and other items of interest so guests will be able to enjoy the beauty of the hotel at night. Well lights will be located in lawn areas, whereas accent lights will occur in groundcover areas; both will be directed away from the observers to prevent direct glare.

Path lights will be located where the tall torches, well lights and accent lights do not provide adequate ambient light to ensure the safety and security of hotel guests. These lights will be carefully placed in areas where there are obstacles or stairs.

Moonlighting will also be used to accentuate the landscaping. Shadows cast onto the ground from breadfruit trees, kukui trees, and other plant material with interesting leaf forms will create rich patterns to delight pedestrians.

The landscape lighting design, which involves the proper selection and location of light fixtures, will permit guests to enjoy the hotel both during the day and at night while serving aesthetic, safety and security purposes.

**Landscape Irrigation Concept**

The irrigation system will be separated according to grass and groundcover areas and the locations of plant material will be based on similar watering requirements; this will ensure that plants which require large amounts of water will be sufficiently irrigated without overwatering those that are less thirsty.

The sprinkler heads will be selected so their precipitation rates do not exceed the infiltration rate of the soil; this will conserve water by eliminating run-off. It will also prevent the leaching of nutrients, pesticides and fertilizers in the soil past the root zone.

The layout of the sprinkler heads will be designed to provide a uniform distribution pattern. Attention will be given to avoid overspraying buildings, walkways, roads, etc.

A drip system will be used to irrigate interior and ornamental plants. It is an efficient means of irrigating because the loss due to evaporation is minimal. There is also no wetting of the building and planters. Drip irrigation systems also reduce the occurrence of insect, disease and fungal problems by minimizing the wetting of the soil surface and plant foliage.

The irrigation system will be controlled by a central computer; this will not only conserve water, but energy and human resources as well. The computerized control system can:

1. Automatically adjust station operating times based on evapotranspiration rates.
2. Connect to a weather station which records air temperature, solar radiation, relative humidity, wind speed, wind direction and rainfall.
3. Create irrigation schedules which can adjust to seasonality and the growth cycle of the plants.
4. Monitor the gallonage of water used on a hourly, daily or seasonal basis.
5. Monitor equipment failures in the system.

A properly designed landscape irrigation system is necessary to keep the plants in a healthy growing condition. Together with a good maintenance program, the landscaping will provide guests with the perfect setting for a memorable vacation experience.
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Note: This graphic was based on a previous version of the master plan with a different Seaside Village configuration. However, signage concepts illustrated are still applicable to the current plan.
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In sum, we find this report acceptable, with the condition that the trench profile drawings be submitted to our office. If you have any questions about these comments, please contact Ms. Annie Griffin at 597-6013.
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SUMMARY

As requested by Mrs. Leilani Kawaiialii, of Inskutaru & Partners, for their client, Sheraton-Maui, Paul H. Rosenfeld, Ph.D., Inc. (PHR) conducted an archaeological subsurface inventory survey within the Sheraton-Maui Redevelopment project area, located in the Land of Hawaiians, Lahaina District, Island of Maui. The basic objective of the survey was to provide information appropriate to and sufficient for satisfaction of all current historic preservation regulatory review requirements of the Maui County Planning Department (MCPO) and the Department of Land and Natural Resources - State Historic Preservation Division (DLNR-SHPD).

The present survey was conducted April 7-9, 1993, under the supervision of Hawaii Projects Manager Donna K. Graves, M.A. Assisting on the project were Field Archaeologists Miles Fager, B.A. and Mike Stirling, B.A. Approximately 72 man hours were required for the field work.

A total of 15 test holes were excavated in three specified areas, to test for possible subsurface cultural deposits. No prehistoric subsurface cultural deposits, burials, or human skeletal remains were identified within the project area.

In view of the negative findings for the current project it is concluded that construction and other activities associated with the redevelopment of the Sheraton-Maui will not affect archaeological or historic sites of significant, and no further treatment or consideration of archaeological resources is necessary.
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BACKGROUND

The present survey was conducted April 3-4, 1993, under the supervision of Project Manager Donna K. Grogan, M. A. Amelice on the project were Field Archaeology Mitakas figure D.A., and Mike Skidgel, D.A. Approximately 72 man-hours were required for the field work.

SCOPES OF WORK

The key purpose of the inventory survey was to identify all sites and features of potential archaeological significance within the designated project area. An inventory survey is an initial level of archaeological inquiry. It is extensive in nature, is conducted with the primary aim of determining the presence or absence of archaeological remains. A survey of this type is used to determine the general nature and variety of archaeological remains present, and the general distribution and density of such remains. It provides a general indication of the archaeological resources, and facilitates formulation of realistic recommendations and strategies for any subsequent mitigation work that might be necessary. Mitigation could include the collection of soil samples, measurements of sites and features, and limited excavations. Such work would also involve the development of both data and research excavation, construction monitoring, interpretive planning and development, and preservation of sites and features with significant archaeological potential, interpretive qualities, and cultural values.

In consideration of the above, the key objectives of the present survey were as follows: (a) to identify all sites and features present within the project area; (b) to evaluate the potential archaeological significance of identified archaeological remains; (c) to determine the possible impacts of proposed development upon the identified remains; and (d) to define the general scope of any subsequent further data collection and other mitigation work that might be necessary or appropriate.

Based on a review of readily available background literature, basic familiarity with the general project area and adjacent facilities, and the current requirements of review authorities, and based on discussions with Mrs. Audie Coffin, DLNR-HIIPD staff archaeologist for Maui County, the following specific tasks were determined to meet the adequate scope of work for the survey:

1. Review archaeological and historical literature relevant to the project area, and conduct limited historical documentation research, with emphasis on readily available data and documentation sources;
2. Conduct subsurface testing by means of backhoe excavations (supervised by hand excavations if appropriate) in order to determine the presence or absence of potentially significant subsurface cultural deposits and features (e.g., midden), (b) to obtain subsurface samples for age determination analysis, and (c) to determine the presence and presence of human skeletal remains;
3. Perform appropriate analyses of field and background research data; and

In consideration of the above, the survey was conducted in three phases: Phase 1 in Area 1, Phase 2 in Area 2, and Phase 3 in Area 3. The Black Rock area in the western portion of the project area did not require subsurface testing due to the presence of significant archaeological remains at some locations. Phase 1 included site survey and subsurface testing (Phase 2 included verification and Phase 3 included verification and subsurface testing). The survey was conducted at the proposed site locations of significant archaeological remains. The survey was conducted in the following areas:

1. Area 1:
   a. Backhoe trench in Area 1
   b. Backhoe trench in Area 2
   2. Area 2:
   a. Backhoe trench in Area 2
   3. Area 3:
   a. Backhoe trench in Area 3
   b. Backhoe trench in Area 3

Despite this minor deviation from the original scope, the project objectives were met. The trenches were to be placed 50 to 200 m apart. The trenches were to be excavated 1.5 m by 1.0 m, and were to be deep enough to permit the evaluation of the presence or absence of significant archaeological remains. Backhoe trenches were to be left open only long enough to record any pertinent archaeological data, and they were to be back-filled.
The inventory survey was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the inventory-level survey recommended by 36 CFR Part 800. The project is located in an archaeological resource area that has been identified in the project area as having been utilized by aboriginal peoples for thousands of years. The project area is located in the Southern Archaic period, which is characterized by the use of stone tools and pottery. The survey was completed by the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) and the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) for the protection of cultural resources.

To assist the client with decisions regarding the project area, the general significance of the resources identified during the inventory survey was also evaluated in terms of potential scientific value. The potential scientific value of the project area is related to the potential of archaeological resources to contribute to our understanding of climate, history, past lifeways, and cultural processes at the level, regional, and interregional levels of organization. Interpretive value refers to the potential of archaeological resources to provide information on the cultural identity and values of the project area.

PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION

The Survey Area Map includes a variety of features, including rock art, rock art sites, and ancient rock art sites. These sites have been identified for further study, and their locations are shown in Figure 2.

In each of the areas, ancient features have been identified. These features include rock art, rock art sites, and ancient rock art sites. The survey was completed by the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) and the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) for the protection of cultural resources.

PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESEARCH

General Overview and Settlement Model

There has been a great deal of research conducted on the island of Maui, and data from archaeological excavations is key to better understanding the ways in which the landscape has been used. The project area is located in the southern part of the island, and the area is characterized by the use of stone tools and pottery. The survey was completed by the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) and the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) for the protection of cultural resources.

One point which should be emphasized is that the project area is located in the southern part of the island, and the area is characterized by the use of stone tools and pottery. The survey was completed by the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) and the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) for the protection of cultural resources.

While some of the information available is valuable, it is not possible to date, to adequately test or evaluate this information on the basis of scientific data. In short, due to the large scale of destruction of sites in this area, it may be impossible to achieve a level of understanding of the historical context that is necessary for further study.

These problems aside, early historic references describe the people of the area as having lived in small, dispersed settlements. This is consistent with the project area being one of the most densely populated areas in the nation, with a population density of 1,500 to 2,000 people per square mile. The project area is located in the southern part of the island, and the area is characterized by the use of stone tools and pottery. The survey was completed by the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) and the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) for the protection of cultural resources.

The area is characterized by the use of stone tools and pottery. The survey was completed by the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) and the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) for the protection of cultural resources.

By the time of the survey, most of the European populations had been cleared from the area, and the area was characterized by the use of stone tools and pottery. The survey was completed by the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) and the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) for the protection of cultural resources.

The project area is located in the southern part of the island, and the area is characterized by the use of stone tools and pottery. The survey was completed by the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) and the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) for the protection of cultural resources.
Specific Archaeological Findings
Supporting Settlement Model

Archaeological surveys began relatively early on Maui. Some of this early work, as much of the subsequent research, has contributed directly to the general settlement and land-use model outlined above.

Wesley Walker's University Museum study involved a partial subsistence and inventory of large sites and areas around the island. Along the shoreline, a short distance southeast of Lahaina, Walker referenced information from Thomas concerning several burial locations (Walker's Sites 7, 8, 9, and 10). However, all of these features had been completely or nearly completely destroyed by the time Walker conducted his own surveys in 1930-1931. Walker did not mention the existence of the site ("Kanaha"") during the present survey. Although major segments of this 19th-century settlement remain intact elsewhere, according to Handy and Handy (1971:49-51):

"...it was here that the ancient Hawaiians once lived, and it was the location of the main village of the ancient Kaauwai people..." Walker identified an additional site, either along the coastline southeast of Lahaina or near the island of Maalaea. Walker notes that the location is currently occupied by a road and by the site of the present-day Kanaha Park.

Some productive research was undertaken in East Maui (Ehrenreich 1967, Pearson 1972), and Clapham's intensive survey and excavation work in Kauai was employed, as were several unpublished patterns of settlement and landuse (Chambers and Kirsh 1979).

During the succeeding decade, and through the 1970s, West Maui began to receive more attention, as urbanization and development led to greater numbers of graves, ceremonial features, and building and excavation projects. Proposed bowl-hearth excavations for Kahului Harbor, which has two miles north of the project area, was conducted on the southwest edge of the stream in the 1970s (Carrion 1973, 1974; Haas and Margolin 1980; U.S. Department of the Interior 1980). The development of the Kamehameha High School Kohala campus and the construction of 28 houses, which included an archaeological survey of the area conducted by the Kalani High School. In 1990, the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Division concluded that the site was not suitable for archaeological research. However, the site was subsequently excavated by the University of Hawaii, which identified two to three large structures, one of which was a large stone wall extending from the water's edge. The site was then destroyed by the construction of a new road.

As part of the 1991-1993 excavation of the Hawaiian Islands Archaeological Survey Project, a survey of the area was conducted by the University of Hawaii, which identified two to three large structures, one of which was a large stone wall extending from the water's edge. The site was then destroyed by the construction of a new road.

Additional work in the same area was conducted by Jormo and Metz (1991, 1992), who identified seven new sites, including two historic sites associated with the Menehune and Waimea areas. These sites included a large building, a large stone wall, and a small stone wall, all of which were destroyed by the construction of a new road.

The area was also surveyed by the University of Hawaii, which identified two to three large structures, one of which was a large stone wall extending from the water's edge. The site was then destroyed by the construction of a new road.

In 1994, the survey of the project area was conducted by the University of Hawaii, which identified two to three large structures, one of which was a large stone wall extending from the water's edge. The site was then destroyed by the construction of a new road.
Reduction for subsurface discontinuities of the sand dune area (Barrow 1962:4). The extensive sandstone-concrete concrete exposure was identified near the surface zone by PKK (Pasadena 1973), but failed to reveal any subsurface concrete. During the excavation, it was found that the massive concrete was approximately 20\% of the core, most of the concrete was removed from the base area. The extensive concrete was removed from the base area, but no evidence was found that it was present in the area, or that such evidence was simply not present.

Still further north, as proposed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture-Division of Soils, a series of old mounds was associated with a program of subsurface archaeological surveys (Walker and frontiers) could explain some of the evidence of the site.

The program was undertaken to evaluate possible subsurface archeological resources of the area, which were previously recorded elsewhere in the area (Kauai). Detailed mapping and subsurface exploration had been undertaken in previous years by the Palau Marine Survey (1938). While finding evidence of the possibility that additional significant cultural material may be found, the location and density is unknown. The proposed systematic evaluation of the archeological potential of the area was undertaken by the Palau Marine Survey (1938).

Specific Findings of Historical Documentary Research Support Settlement Model

As noted above, a number of archaeological and historical resources describe events and activities in the late 19th and early 20th centuries in the Kauai area. A comprehensive survey of the site, including Kauai sites and other locations, was undertaken by the Palau Marine Survey (1938). The results of that survey are described in this chapter. The evidence is consistent with a potential settlement model constructed in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

In the early 20th century, Kauai was a center of activity for the Kauai residents, and a number of activities were conducted in the area. The evidence is consistent with the potential settlement model constructed in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.
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Kekwa was the capital of Maiti when Kathalawan was relocating westward. Many houses were constructed and people cultivated a great deal of potatoes, bananas, sugar cane, and things of a like nature. They believed that the city from Kekwa to tahaike and Wabitihi — that country near the water — was then an early city in the land of Lahaii — all was cultivated.

According to Maitly (Appendix A), Black Rock was believed to be where their ancestors were living, being a place where the sails of the dead washed into the west world. Local informants also recall a ceremony located near Kekwa's 'point' according to Black's research.

By the late 1860s most of Lahaii's residents, including the missionaries, had arrived around 1833, and the whale, whose presence peaked between about 1840 and 1850, had left the area as a food source. During this period, Lahaii became the focus of early sugar cane production and processing companies. By 1849, Judge D. H. Powers operated a sugar mill at Lahaii. This mill, along with 1,000 acres of land, was sold to O. G. Galick at auction. Henry Dicken, a Lahaii sons owner, began a plantation in 1839, and the success of his Lahaii Sugar Co. encouraged the establishment of a second plantation the following year, Pioneer Mills Co. It was founded by three partners, James Campbell, Henry Farve, and James Danforth, on lands leased to them by Benjamin F. Paine. In 1863, Lahaii Sugar Co. went bankrupt and sold out to Pioneer Mills Co. (Cooke 1933:223). Another plantation, opened in 1870 by Lot Plantamour and others, was also bought out by Pioneer Mills Co. a few years later.

The firm of Walker & Alton appear to have been the plantation agents in the early years, but in 1877 H. H. Field replaced them (Cooke 1933:323). An 1883 evaluation of plantations by H. H. Field for Pioneer Mills Co. rated at $50,000 (Field 1934).

From its modest beginnings in 1833, Pioneer Mills eventually became the largest sugar plantation in West Maine. In 1864 the mill began construction of a second sugar mill to handle cane in the processing plant. Several lines were constructed, including one that originated at the operations site, south Lahaii, and proceeded northwest toward the Kekwa's location just north of the current project. According to Clark (1997:13):

A building was built on the north side of Black Rock (Pic-A-Kita) to chop the sugar that was bagged and processed at the mill in Lahaii and loaded by the loading by train. The bagged sugar was stored in a warehouse to the rear of Black Rock. When the sugar began to be loaded, the bags were run out to the ends of the loading area. Other buildings in the area included oil and molasses tanks and, on the beach, a pavilion and beach concessionaire for Pioneer Mills Co.'s Supervisor.

Shearon Mill employees who grew up in the area also recall loading boys and a canning building on the site of the present beach. The loading of Black Rock was abandoned just prior to World War II, according to Maitly (Appendix A).

In 1855, when the company was finally incorporated, Pioneer Mills began a periodic study of growth and expansion. During this same decade Henry B. Baldwin established Homeville Ranch. Interested in using his extensive West Maine lands for sheep, Baldwin brought David C. Filmore to Harrison as the ranch manager. Filmore had been with the original Black Rock sugar plantation from the start, and in a few years, established pineapple plants as a commercial crop in West Maine. Baldwin's Parkers opened a sawmill in Lahaii in December 1859, which provided employment for many local residents.

Extensive field clearing and road construction was undertaken in conjunction with these sugar cane and pineapple plantation operations, beginning with the initial rail operations around the middle of the 1870s and continuing, with increasing mechanization and efficiency, through the first two or three decades of the 20th century. This may be considered a time of rapid development and establishment of carved-out characteristics that once existed in the Lahaii area.

Sugar cane and pineapple also reached Lahaii economically until the sugar industry began declining in the 1950s. Lahaii's industry finally closed in the early 1960s. Many residents had to leave the town and the surrounding villages for other parts of Hawaii. During this same period, however, American influence, the owner of Pioner Mills Co., had begun developing an 800-acre site at the south end of Lahaii, which included the Lahaii and the Ranch and Black Rock, known as the Klondike. This development marked the beginning of a new period of expansion and environmental growth Lahaii, which continued during the 1970s. Some additional impacts to local natural resources accompanied these developments, particularly the Klondike and Lahaii expansion, which were considered important to the study.

The Klondike and Lahaii expansion, which was considered important to the study, was examined from the surface. Because it appeared almost identical to the site, the project would rely on surface operations in evaluating subsurface features. Stratigraphic information was recorded for each significant layer in each trench (except Trench C) using standard Soil Conservation Service guidelines (Soil Survey Staff 1963) and a Kansall Color Nomenclature Chart.
FINDINGS

Subsurface testing within the three designated areas (Area 1-3) concluded the excavation of 15 backhoe trenches. A summary of all backhoe trenching results is presented in Table 1, which provides trench number, main layer depth, number of soil layers identified, and comments regarding the individual trenches. Detailed stratigraphic information for each trench is presented in Appendix B. Field drawings of representative sections of each trench are included with this report.

Each of the 15 backhoe trenches was 5.0 meters in length and 0.75 meters wide (bucket width). Stratigraphic deposits within the trenches varied from as few as five layers to as many as nine layers. Depths varied from 1.50 to 2.90 meters.

Area 1

Three trenches were placed in Area 1 (Figure 6). Generally, all three of the trenches displayed a mixed stratigraphy of diatomaceous sand, sandy till, and sandy clay with a great deal of the natural and interbedded typical of diatomaceous deposit. The deposits in the eastern trench appeared to be backfilled fill, which an analysis, and the presence of modern trash (i.e., glass and metal fragments) was observed in Layer V of Trenches 2 and 3. A backhoe channel lens encountered in Trench 3 at 1.12 cm, may be related to area of modern fills identified elsewhere in the trench. The channel lens was not associated with cultural materials, and was in introduced fill. The water table was encountered at 2.90 m in BTL, approximately along directly under the introduced fill. No inverts and deposits were noted in Area 1, nor were any prehistoric materials encountered.

Area 2

Five backhoe trenches were placed in Area 2 (Figure 9). Generally, all five of the trenches displayed a mixed stratigraphy of alternating heavy sand, clay, and mud, and grave, all interbedded typical of diatomaceous fill. In Trench 6, the upper surface was composed of gravel deposits that may have been an older surface at one time, although there was possibly introduced fill below it. The water table was encountered at 2.20 m in Area 2. No backhoe fills or deposits were noted in Area 2, nor were any prehistoric materials encountered.

Area 3

A total of seven backhoe trenches were placed in Area 3 (Figure 6). The layout of utility lines, buildings, and landscaping prohibited the placement of more trenches in this area. Generally, Layers III, IV, and V (4.90 m) may have been backhoe fills due to the presence of a thick layer of fill and with little or no interbedding. All layers within each of the trenches were culturally sterile.
Table 1.
BACKHOE TRENCH SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DT</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Max. Depth m</th>
<th>Layers</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>ST-1 in Layer IV (non-cultural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>I-V</td>
<td>Recent historic artifacts in Layer V, water table at 290 cmbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>I-VII</td>
<td>Modern glass fragments in Layer VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>I-IX</td>
<td>sterile; water table encountered at 233 cmbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>I-IX</td>
<td>sterile; water table at 230 cmbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>I-IX</td>
<td>Layer IX possibly intact sand; water table at 234 cmbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>I-VII</td>
<td>sterile; water table at 231 cmbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>I-VII</td>
<td>sterile; water table at 220 cmbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>I-VII</td>
<td>sterile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>I-V</td>
<td>sterile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>I-VII</td>
<td>Layer VI possibly intact sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>I-III</td>
<td>Layer III possibly intact sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>Layer IV possibly intact sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>I-V</td>
<td>sterile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>sterile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All layers appear to be bordered fill unless otherwise noted.

Although historic decompaction indicated the possible presence of human remains in the project area, no such remains were identified during backhoe testing. And while the Xay's area has been described as densely populated during the protohistoric period, no historic cultural deposits were noted. Instead, four, if any, soil deposits in the redevelopment area are intact; most of these are fill.

Preliminary tests have identified Xay's area as an important historic site, associated with the development of the Flores Mill. However, no intact historic deposits were located in the specified project area. Therefore, the area may be subject to the removal of disturbance that had already occurred in the area.

Each of the areas tested during the current work provided evidence of modern erosion, probably associated with construction of the hotel in the late 1970s. While a few modern materials such as glass and metal were associated with the layer of intact sand, they appear to be typical of modern (i.e., fragmented, burned) rather than representative of an intact historic deposit. No pathogenic cultural materials or significant historic artifacts were located in any of the areas. In addition, the backhoe testing did not indicate the identification of human remains or any human activity remains.

In view of the negative findings for the current project, it is concluded that construction and other activities associated with the redevelopment of the Sheraton Hotel will not affect archaeological sites associated with the site Xay's. Further testing or consideration of archaeological resources is not necessary. None of the areas (I-V) are cited for erosion during the proposed redevelopment (gen. perm., John Robertson, Chief Engineer, Sheraton Hotel). Thus the backhoe testing eliminated the potential for deposition in sampled areas during construction is low.

The above conclusions are based on the findings of a subsoil testing survey using backhoe trenches to sample specified areas. Thus, there is always the possibility, however remote, that potentially significant undiscovered cultural remains might be encountered in the course of future development activities. In such a situation, archaeological consultation should be sought immediately.
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APPENDIX A

HISTORICAL DOCUMENTARY RESEARCH by Kupa Mali

The Hawaiki Moai KIta Maui Beach Hotel project area is located in the Lahaina District in the Kakaako area of Oahu. It is a 10-minute walk from the hotel to the beach, passing through the lush Kakaako Park. This area is known for its beautiful sunsets and ocean views.

The hotel features a variety of amenities, including a spa, a pool, and a fitness center. The rooms are spacious and well-appointed, offering a comfortable stay for visitors. The hotel also offers a variety of dining options, including a full-service restaurant and a poolside cafe.

In the 18th century, the area was a重要的毛伊岛部落的中心。Kealakekua Bay was the site of the Battle of Kealakekua, where Kamehameha I defeated the last remnants of the independent chiefdoms of the Hawaiian Islands.

In the 19th century, the area became a popular destination for European and American sailors, who would gather to trade for Hawaiian goods and to explore the island. The area was also the site of several important events in Hawaiian history, including the signing of the 1819 Treaty of Kekaha Kai, which established a framework for trade and diplomacy between the Hawaiian Islands and the United States.

By the early 1900s, the area had become a popular tourist destination, with many visitors arriving by boat to explore the island and to experience the local culture. Today, the area remains a popular destination for visitors, with many attractions and activities to enjoy.

*Note: This text is based on historical research and may not reflect the latest developments or changes to the area.*
The traditional division of fish in the following narrative is as follows:


Concerning the great amount of human basted fish placed on the altar of the great number of people at Lake Kakaako, a document of the year 1817 notes the activity of several bloody battles, and describes the life and deaths of the Almighty's people. In this regard, the Hawaiian concept of a "sacred" (spiced) basted fish is also mentioned above in the Kaha narrative, an important one in the context of the Kaha's area. Hawaiian literature describes the importance of the Kaha in the Hawaiian concept of the afterlife following death, such as a source of sustenance for the soul and the maintenance of the soul.

The concept of a "sacred" basted fish is also described in the following narrative.

There were fish that lived in the area, a place where there was a valley in the sea floor below a shallow reef. If you lived on an island and wished to trade, it was easy to trade for food. You could go to the island and catch fish from the sea floor, and you could go to the island and catch fish from the sea floor.

There were legends about these places, and the people living in the western, southwestern, and southern parts of the island.

As the discussion and devotion to the Kaha continues, there are references to other places and other events.

According to Ha'ae, in the Hawaiian Poetics (1962):

On the north side of western Maui, the coast is dotted with large rock formations and isolated fishing areas where some species of fish were abundant. The Kaha in this area were usually about a mile or so from the shore, and they were used to catch fish for food. They were used to catch fish for food. They were used to catch fish for food. They were used to catch fish for food. They were used to catch fish for food. They were used to catch fish for food. They were used to catch fish for food. They were used to catch fish for food. They were used to catch fish for food.

Regarding the Kaha, in the Hawaiian Poetics (1962):
of land that was nearly divided into little fields and held out in the highest state of cultivation and improvement by being placed in the same regular manner with the different excellent seeds and useful and nutritious plants by the labor and care of the owners and by the care of the farmers who attended the same. The farmers are such as are known as the best farmers in the country, and the land is improved by the best methods of cultivation. The farmers are such as are known as the best farmers in the country, and the land is improved by the best methods of cultivation.
In his description of the shorelines and features in the age of Kane'Ai, Clark offers the following narrative:

The beach facing the park was once known to locals as Keauhou Beach. Keauhou was also the name of a still-popular surfing beach facing the neighboring Hyatt Regency Hotel. During the early 1960s' Pioneer Mill constructed a rock cracker near Ho'okipa Beach; this facility was used to crush rock for construction projects.

Karen Keauhau and Lahaina has proven to be well suited for the development of hotels, condominiums, and shops, with major construction continuing in the upper elevations.
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APPENDIX B

STRATIGRAPHIC DESCRIPTIONS

AREA 1

Table of stratigraphic descriptions follows. For a more detailed description, refer to the original text provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 3</th>
<th>B54, SE FACE</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-5 cm: ranges from 8 to 10 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (SYR 3/10 moist); sandy clay; dark reddish brown (SYR 3/10 dry); weak, massive structure; very friable, slightly sticky; non-plastic consistency; many micro to fine tubular roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile, sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>10-20 cm: ranges from 10-20 cm in thickness; strong brown (SYR 3/5C dry); moderate, very fine to fine granular structure; soft, fairly, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; many micro to fine tubular roots; many fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; gradate, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>20-40 cm: ranges from 10-20 cm in thickness; strong brown (SYR 3/5C dry); moderate, very fine to fine granular structure; soft, fairly, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; many micro to fine tubular roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>40-80 cm: ranges from 8-16 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (SYR 3/4 moist); dark reddish brown (SYR 3/4 dry); weak, massive structure; soft, fairly, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; many micro to fine tubular roots; many fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>80-160 cm: ranges from 8-16 cm in thickness; medium very pale brown and strong brown (SYR 3/4 and 3/5C moist); very pale brown and strong brown (SYR 3/4 moist); brown sand; medium very pale brown and strong brown (SYR 3/4 and 3/5C dry); soft, fairly, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; few medium tubular roots; many fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>160-256 cm: ranges from 8-16 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (SYR 3/4C dry); weak, massive structure; soft, fairly, slightly sticky, plastic consistency; few medium tubular roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>256-400 cm: ranges from 8-16 cm in thickness; brown (SYR 3/4C moist); sandy clay; weak, very fine granular structure; loose, loose, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>400-600 cm: ranges from 8-16 cm in thickness; brown (SYR 3/4C moist); sandy clay; weak, very fine granular structure; loose, loose, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>600-1000 cm: ranges from 8-16 cm in thickness; brown (SYR 3/4C moist); sandy clay; weak, very fine granular structure; loose, loose, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 3</th>
<th>B55, SE FACE</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-5 cm: ranges from 8 to 10 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (SYR 3/10 moist); sandy clay; dark reddish brown (SYR 3/10 dry); weak, massive structure; very friable, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; many micro to fine tubular roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile, sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>10-20 cm: ranges from 10-20 cm in thickness; strong brown (SYR 3/5C dry); moderate, very fine to fine granular structure; soft, fairly, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; many micro to fine tubular roots; many fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; gradate, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>20-40 cm: ranges from 10-20 cm in thickness; strong brown (SYR 3/5C dry); moderate, very fine to fine granular structure; soft, fairly, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; many micro to fine tubular roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>40-80 cm: ranges from 8-16 cm in thickness; medium very pale brown and strong brown (SYR 3/4 and 3/5C moist); very pale brown and strong brown (SYR 3/4 moist); brown sand; medium very pale brown and strong brown (SYR 3/4 and 3/5C dry); soft, fairly, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; few medium tubular roots; many fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>80-160 cm: ranges from 8-16 cm in thickness; medium very pale brown and strong brown (SYR 3/4 and 3/5C moist); very pale brown and strong brown (SYR 3/4 moist); brown sand; medium very pale brown and strong brown (SYR 3/4 and 3/5C dry); soft, extremely fine, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>160-256 cm: generally 14 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (SYR 3/24 moist); clay; dark reddish brown (SYR 3/24 dry); weak, massive structure; very friable, slightly sticky, plastic consistency; few medium tubular roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>256-400 cm: ranges from 5-7 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (SYR 3/11C moist); sandy clay; moderate, fine granular structure; soft, fairly, slightly sticky, plastic consistency; few medium tubular roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>400-600 cm: ranges from 5-7 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (SYR 3/11C moist); sandy clay; moderate, fine granular structure; soft, fairly, slightly sticky, plastic consistency; few medium tubular roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>600-1000 cm: ranges from 5-7 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (SYR 3/11C moist); sandy clay; moderate, fine granular structure; soft, fairly, slightly sticky, plastic consistency; few medium tubular roots; many very fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; sloping, wavy boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

B-3

Layer Description

I 0-25 cm: range from 10-25 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (7YR 3/4 medium); heavy clay; dark reddish brown (7YR 3/4 dark); strong, very fine to medium crack structure; hard, fibrous, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; many roots to medium and vesicular; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

II 25-50 cm: range from 20-50 cm in thickness; medium very pale yellow brown and yellowish red (10YR 4/4 and 5/4 medium); heavy sand; medium, very pale yellow brown and brown (7.5YR 6/1 medium); moderate, fine single grain structure; soft, very friable, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; some veins to medium and vesicular; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

III 50-55 cm: generally 5 cm in thickness; yellowish red (10YR 4/5 medium); heavy sand; brown (7.5YR 5/4 dark); moderate, fine single grain structure; bones, extant roots, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

IV 55-100 cm: range from 30-41 cm in thickness; medium very pale yellow and yellowish red (7YR 7/4 and 8/4 medium); heavy sand; medium, dark reddish brown and brown (7.5YR 6/4 and 7.5YR 6/4 medium); moderate, very fine single grain structure; bones, extant roots, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

V 100-110 cm: range from 10-15 cm in thickness; medium yellowish red and dark reddish brown (7YR 4/4 and 4/5 medium); mixed clay and sand; medium, dark reddish brown and brown (7YR 3/4 and 7.5YR 4/4 medium); hard, fibrous, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

VI 110-120 cm: generally 10 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (7YR 3/4 medium); heavy clay; very dark brown (7.5YR 3/4 dark); weak, massive structure; soft, friable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

VII 120-125 cm: generally 10 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (7YR 4/4 medium); heavy sand; reddish brown (7YR 4/4 dark); moderate, fine single grain structure; soft, friable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

VIII 130-155 cm: range from 30-35 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (7YR 2/4 medium); clay; dark reddish brown (7YR 3/4 dark); weak, massive structure; hard, fibrous, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

IX 155+ cm: very pale brown (10YR 4/4 medium); sand; very pale brown (10YR 5/4 dark); strong, very fine single grain structure; hard, fibrous, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench.

Layer Description

I 0-25 cm: range from 10-25 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (7YR 3/4 medium); heavy clay; dark reddish brown (7YR 3/4 dark); strong, very fine to medium crack structure; hard, fibrous, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; many roots to medium and vesicular; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

II 25-50 cm: range from 20-50 cm in thickness; medium very pale yellow brown and yellowish red (10YR 4/4 and 5/4 medium); heavy sand; brown (7.5YR 5/4 dark); moderate, fine single grain structure; bones, extremely fine, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; many roots to medium and vesicular; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

III 50-55 cm: generally 5 cm in thickness; yellowish red (10YR 4/5 medium); heavy sand; brown (7.5YR 5/4 dark); moderate, fine single grain structure; bones, extant roots, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

IV 55-100 cm: range from 30-41 cm in thickness; medium very pale yellow and yellowish red (7YR 7/4 and 8/4 medium); heavy sand; medium, dark reddish brown and brown (7.5YR 6/4 and 7.5YR 6/4 medium); moderate, very fine single grain structure; bones, extant roots, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

V 100-110 cm: range from 10-15 cm in thickness; medium yellowish red and dark reddish brown (7YR 4/4 and 4/5 medium); mixed clay and sand; medium, dark reddish brown and brown (7YR 3/4 and 7.5YR 4/4 medium); hard, fibrous, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

VI 110-120 cm: generally 10 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (7YR 3/4 medium); heavy clay; very dark brown (7.5YR 3/4 dark); weak, massive structure; soft, friable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

VII 120-125 cm: generally 10 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (7YR 4/4 medium); heavy sand; reddish brown (7YR 4/4 dark); moderate, fine single grain structure; soft, friable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

VIII 130-155 cm: range from 30-35 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (7YR 2/4 medium); clay; dark reddish brown (7YR 3/4 dark); weak, massive structure; hard, fibrous, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; flat, very boundary;

IX 155+ cm: very pale brown (10YR 4/4 medium); sand; very pale brown (10YR 5/4 dark); strong, very fine single grain structure; hard, fibrous, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine interstitial porosity; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench.
| Layer Description |  
|-------------------|---|
| 0-30 cm, orange to brown, sparse, few fine roots; slightly sandy, clean, angular boulders |  
| 30-60 cm, orange to brown; dark reddish-brown (0.5R 5/6); heavy clay; weak, massive structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; steep to clear, irregular boundary |  
| 40-70 cm, orange to brown; dark reddish-brown (0.5YR 5/4); strong, very fine single grain structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench |  
| 70-100 cm, yellow (10YR 7/6); sand, very fine brown (5YR 6/4); strong, very fine single grain structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench |  
| 0-30 cm, generally 25 cm in thickness; very dark brown (3/2); heavy clay; strong, very fine to fine coarse structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; many roots in fine vesicular root; many fine to very fine imbricated pebbles; steep, irregular boundary |  
| 30-60 cm, orange to brown; dark reddish-brown (0.5YR 5/6); heavy clay; weak, massive structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; steep to clear, irregular boundary |  
| 40-70 cm, orange to brown; dark reddish-brown (0.5YR 5/4); strong, very fine single grain structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench |  
| 70-100 cm, yellow (10YR 7/6); sand, very fine brown (5YR 6/4); strong, very fine single grain structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench |  
| 0-30 cm, generally 25 cm in thickness; very dark brown (3/2); heavy clay; strong, very fine to fine coarse structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; many roots in fine vesicular root; many fine to very fine imbricated pebbles; steep, irregular boundary |  
| 30-60 cm, orange to brown; dark reddish-brown (0.5YR 5/6); heavy clay; weak, massive structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; steep to clear, irregular boundary |  
| 40-70 cm, orange to brown; dark reddish-brown (0.5YR 5/4); strong, very fine single grain structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench |  
| 70-100 cm, yellow (10YR 7/6); sand, very fine brown (5YR 6/4); strong, very fine single grain structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench |  
| 0-30 cm, generally 25 cm in thickness; very dark brown (3/2); heavy clay; strong, very fine to fine coarse structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; many roots in fine vesicular root; many fine to very fine imbricated pebbles; steep, irregular boundary |  
| 30-60 cm, orange to brown; dark reddish-brown (0.5YR 5/6); heavy clay; weak, massive structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; steep to clear, irregular boundary |  
| 40-70 cm, orange to brown; dark reddish-brown (0.5YR 5/4); strong, very fine single grain structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench |  
| 70-100 cm, yellow (10YR 7/6); sand, very fine brown (5YR 6/4); strong, very fine single grain structure; hard, fiddable, slightly sticky, non-plastic consistency; no roots; many very fine to fine imbricated pebbles; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench |
IV 10-50 cm; generally 15 cm in thickness; brown (19YR 4/6 moist); tenacious; moderate; fine single grain structure; loose, loose, slightly sticky; non-plastic consistency; no root; culturally sterile; abrupt, wavy boundary.

V 50-100 cm; yellow (10YR 3/6 moist); sand, very pale brown (10YR 4/4 dry); strong, fine single grain structure; loose, loose, non-sticky; non-plastic consistency; no root; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench.

BP 15, N face

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-30 cm; range from 16-30 cm in thickness; dark reddish brown (10YR 3/3 dry); waxy clay; strong, very fine to fine crust structure; soft, friable, slightly sticky, slightly plastic consistency; many roots to coarse tuber and vesicle root; many very fine to fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; abrupt, wavy boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>30-60 cm; range from 30-40 cm in thickness; light yellowish brown (10YR 6/4 dry); sand; strong, fine single grain structure; loose, loose, non-sticky; non-plastic consistency; many roots to coarse tuber and vesicle root; many very fine to fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; abrupt, wavy boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>60-75 cm; range from 40-50 cm in thickness; dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4 dry); loamy sand; moderate, very fine single grain structure; loose, loose, non-sticky; non-plastic consistency; no root; many very fine to fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; abrupt, wavy boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>70-90 cm; light yellowish brown (10YR 4/4 dry); sand; strong fine single grain structure; loose, loose, non-sticky; non-plastic consistency; no root; many very fine to fine interstitial pores; culturally sterile; layer continues below base of trench.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The existing Sheraton Maui Hotel is located in the Kaanapali Beach Resort area on the west coast of the Island of Maui, approximately three miles north of Lahaina (See Figures 1). The Kaanapali Beach Resort is a 1,200-acre master planned resort community that includes six hotels, six residential condominium projects, a shopping center/whaling museum, and two 18-hole golf courses.

The 510-guest room Sheraton Maui Hotel was the first to develop within the Kaanapali Beach Resort. It is situated on 23-acres of land located in the northern portion of the Kaanapali Beach Resort adjacent to the ocean.

The Kyo-ya Company, Ltd. proposes to renovate the Sheraton Maui Hotel, upgrading existing facilities to meet current federal, state, and county code requirements, as well as improving the aesthetic and functional aspects of the hotel. The renovation project will result in a net increase of one new 2,000 square foot Japanese restaurant that will only be open for dinner and approximately 18,000 square feet of new executive meeting facilities. This renovation project will also result in the property being brought into conformance with current County parking regulations, increasing the current parking stall count from 203 stalls to 600 stalls. No net change in the existing room count of 510 guest rooms is proposed.

This traffic assessment evaluates the potential traffic impact renovation of the Sheraton Maui Hotel would have on the surrounding roadway system.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The project site is located at the northwestern terminus of Kaanapali Parkway within the Kaanapali Beach Resort area. Access to the project site is currently provided through two driveways located on the cut-de-sac at the northwestern terminus of Kaanapali Parkway.
Existing Roadways

Honoapiilani Highway is the primary link through Central Maui and around the southwestern coast of the Island of Maui. It connects the Wailuku area in the northeast with Kahului in the south, Lahaina in the southwest, and Kapalua in the northwest. Honoapiilani Highway is a two-lane highway with limited passing areas between Wailuku and Lahaina. From Lihainaxena Road to Kaanapali Parkway, Honoapiilani Highway widens to a four-lane highway with two through lanes provided in each direction. North of its intersection with Kaanapali Parkway, Honoapiilani Highway transitions from a four-lane roadway to a two-lane roadway with paved shoulders at its intersection with Kekaa Drive. Within the study area, the posted speed limit on Honoapiilani Highway is 35 miles per hour.

Kaanapali Parkway is a two-lane roadway with 28-foot wide lanes and a landscaped center median. It is the primary roadway through the Kaanapali Beach Resort area providing circulation and access to several hotels and other resort facilities. It is generally aligned in the northwest-southeast direction and has a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour. On its southeastern terminus, Kaanapali Parkway intersects Honoapiilani Highway forming the western (mauka) leg of a signalized cross intersection. East (makai) of Honoapiilani Highway, Kaanapali Parkway continues as Halai Street, a two-lane local roadway. Kaanapali Parkway terminates on its northeastern end in a cul-de-sac at the entrance to the Sheraton Maui Hotel.

Kekaa Drive serves as a secondary access to the Kaanapali Beach Resort area. It is a two-lane local roadway that is generally aligned in the northwest-southeast direction. On its northeastern (mauka) end, Kekaa Drive runs parallel to Honoapiilani Highway. A short connector road branches off Kekaa Drive forming the stop controlled stem of a T-intersection with Honoapiilani Highway. On its southeastern (makai) end, Kekaa Drive intersects Kaanapali Parkway forming the stop controlled stem of a T-intersection.
Existing Traffic Conditions

Peak hour turning movement counts, as presented in the Kaanapali Beach Hotel Expansion Project: Traffic Impact Report, dated September 1990, were conducted at the intersection of Honoapiilani Highway and Kaanapali Parkway in July 1990. Forecast year 1993 traffic volumes presented in this report were based on an estimated average annual growth rate of 4.2 percent. This 4.2 percent average annual growth rate was derived from the Honoapiilani Highway Puunene to Honolulu Draft Environmental Impact Statement. A review of peak hour traffic counts conducted by the State Department of Transportation (SDOT) and summarized in the 1991 Traffic Summary for the Island of Maui on Honoapiilani Highway and on Kaanapali Parkway revealed a comparable average annual growth rate.

Intersection capacity was analyzed at the Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection using the planning methodology outlined in the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) for signalized intersections. Analyses based on forecast 1993 traffic volumes that included traffic generated by the proposed Kaanapali Beach Hotel Expansion Project revealed that this intersection operates near-capacity during the a.m. peak hour and over-capacity during the p.m. peak hour.

Converting the dedicated southbound right-turn lane on Honoapiilani Highway into a shared through/right-turn lane, as recommended in the Kaanapali Beach Hotel Expansion Project: Traffic Impact Report, and widening the southern leg of Honoapiilani Highway to provide a free right-turn movement from eastbound Kaanapali Parkway to southbound Honoapiilani Highway will improve intersection operations under-capacity conditions during the a.m. peak hour and near-capacity conditions during the p.m. peak hour.

FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Renovation of the existing 510-room Sheraton Maui Hotel is proposed by the Kyo-yo Company, Ltd. The proposed renovation project will result in an net increase of one 2,000 square foot Japanese restaurant, approximately 18,000 square feet of new executive meeting facilities, and no net change in the existing 510-room count. The renovation project will include upgrading existing facilities to meet current federal, state, and county code requirements, as well as improving the aesthetic and functional aspects of the hotel. The property will also be brought into conformance with current parking requirements, increasing the existing 203 parking stall count to 600 parking stalls. The proposed Sheraton Maui Renovation Project is anticipated to be complete by the future year 1995.

BASE YEAR 1995

Base year conditions (no-build) assumes that the Sheraton Maui Hotel would not be renovated. Development in the adjoining communities of Lahaina, Napali, and Kapalua, however, generate additional traffic causing volumes on Honoapiilani Highway to increase. Base year 1995 traffic volumes at the Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection were forecast from the 1990 turning movements counts by applying an average annual growth rate of 4.2 percent per year.

For base year 1995 conditions, with the existing roadway geometries, traffic volumes at the Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection would experience over-capacity operating conditions during both the a.m. and the p.m. peak hours. Modifying the dedicated southbound right-turn lane to a shared through/right-turn lane and widening Honoapiilani Highway to maintain the free eastbound right-turn movement from Kaanapali Parkway, as identified above, will increase capacity and improve intersection operations. With these improvements, the Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection will experience under-capacity operating conditions during the a.m. peak hour. During the p.m. peak hour, however, this intersection will continue to experience over-capacity operating conditions.

FUTURE YEAR 1995 WITH PROJECT

The Future With Project section of this report contains information regarding future year traffic forecasts; generation, distribution, and assignment of project trips and analysis of its effects on the surrounding roadway system at project build-out.
Trip Generation

Trip generation is the estimation of vehicular trips attracted or produced by the project. Trip generation rates published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers in the "Trip Generation Manual, Fifth Edition," were used to estimate the volume of traffic generated by the one additional 2,000 square foot restaurant proposed for construction in the renovation project.

A free-standing 2,000 square foot quality restaurant is estimated to generate a total of 2 vehicle trips during the a.m. peak hour and 15 vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour. Since this proposed restaurant will be within the hotel complex, a significant portion of the traffic generated is anticipated to be either internal to the hotel (pedestrian traffic) or internal to the Kāanapali Beach Resort area. Only 25 percent of the traffic generated was, therefore, assumed to be vehicular traffic that would enter or exit the Kāanapali Beach Resort area. The new 2,000 square foot Japanese restaurant is, therefore, estimated to generate 1 vehicular trips during the a.m. peak hour and 4 vehicular trips during the p.m. peak hour.

Due to the lack of statistical information on the trip generation characteristics of meeting rooms within resort hotels, the trip generation characteristics of the 18,000 square foot executive meeting space was based on information provided by the Sheraton Maui Hotel.

The Sheraton Maui Hotel anticipates a maximum daily attendance of 400 people and an average attendance of 200 people per weekday. This meeting area, which consists of 14,000 square feet of meeting space and a 4,000 square foot foyer, is anticipated to be used less than fifty percent of the time.

For analysis purposes, the maximum anticipated attendance of 400 people was used to define the trip generation potential of the additional meeting facilities. This analysis, therefore, represents a worst-case scenario.

The majority of the people attending meetings are anticipated to stay at the Sheraton Maui Hotel. Others may also stay at adjoining hotels within the Kāanapali Beach Resort area. For analysis purposes, it was assumed that 90 percent of the traffic generated by the additional meeting facilities would be internal to the Sheraton Maui Hotel or internal to the Kāanapali Beach Resort area. The remaining ten percent of the traffic generated by the 18,000 square foot meeting facilities were, therefore, estimated to generate 40 vehicular trips during the a.m. and the p.m. peak hours. The total net increase in traffic estimated to be generated by the proposed renovation project is summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM PEAK</th>
<th>PM PEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Restaurant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Meeting Facility</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trip Distribution

Trip distribution estimates the origins and destinations of the project-generated traffic. Project-generated trips were distributed in two directions: north towards Kapalua/Kāanapali and south towards Lahaina. Trip distribution factors used for this project are summarized in Table 2. These trip distribution factors were based on the location of population and employment centers in the surrounding area and on the existing traffic distribution patterns observed at the Kapalua/Kāanapali Road/Lahaina Parkway intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM PEAK</th>
<th>PM PEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapalua/Kāanapali</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahaina</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trip Assignment

Traffic generated by the proposed renovation project was assigned onto the existing circulation system using distribution factors presented in Table 2. Project-generated traffic, as shown in Figure 2, was assigned onto Kanapali Parkway and to the Honopilani Highway/Kanapali Parkway intersection since it is the primary point of access to the Kanapali Beach Resort area. The 1985 With and Without Project traffic volumes are shown on Figure 3.

Project Impacts

The proposed renovation project is forecast to generate 41 additional vehicle trips during the a.m. peak hour and 44 vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour. The impact of these additional vehicle trips to the surrounding roadway system was assessed by re-evaluating operations at the Honopilani Highway/Kanapali Parkway intersection during the a.m. and the p.m. peak hours.

Analysis reveals that the existing Honopilani Highway/Kanapali Parkway intersection would continue to experience over-capacity operating conditions during both the a.m. and the p.m. peak hours. With the intersection improvements identified previously, this intersection would operate under-capacity during the a.m. peak hour. During the p.m. peak hour, however, this intersection would continue to experience over-capacity operating conditions.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The HonopiiLani Highway/Kanapali Parkway intersection currently experiences near-capacity operating conditions during the a.m. peak hour and over-capacity operating conditions during the p.m. peak hour. Intersection improvements are, therefore, already needed to increase capacity and reduce existing congestion. Converting the dedicated southbound right-turn lane to a shared through/right-turn lane and widening the southern leg of HonopiiLani Highway to maintain the free right-turn movement from eastbound Kanapali Parkway to southbound HonopiiLani Highway will increase capacity and improve intersection operations. Even with these improvements, however, over-capacity operating conditions are anticipated during the p.m. peak hour in 1995 without the renovation project.

The State Department of Transportation proposes to construct a new road that bypasses the town of Lahaina on an eastern (mauka) alignment as a long-term solution to relieve capacity constraints within this corridor. This Lahaina By-Pass Road will provide an alternative route around the town of Lahaina between the Kapalua/Napili areas and areas south of Lahaina. A significant diversion of traffic volumes off HonopiiLani Highway is anticipated with the completion of this new facility. This anticipated diversion of traffic off HonopiiLani Highway and onto the Lahaina By-Pass Road will significantly improve operating conditions at the HonopiiLani Highway/Kanapali Parkway intersection by reducing the volume of through traffic on HonopiiLani Highway that passes through this intersection.

The Sheraton Maui Hotel Renovation project will result in only a nominal increase in traffic volumes through the HonopiiLani Highway/Kanapali Parkway intersection. Traffic generated by the renovation project is anticipated to increase 1995 traffic volumes through the HonopiiLani Highway/Kanapali Parkway intersection by two percent or less during both the a.m. and the p.m. peak hours.

The additional 2,000 square foot restaurant and 16,000 square foot of executive meeting facilities proposed for construction with the renovation project are forecast to generate an additional 41 vehicle trips during the a.m. peak hour.
and 44 vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour. These additional vehicular trips result in an increase in overall traffic volumes of two percent or less on Honoapiilani Highway and less than five percent on Kaanapali Parkway during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours in the future year 1995.

Because the additional facilities proposed for construction with the renovation project have only a nominal trip generation potential and because intersection improvements at the Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection are required without or with the project, no mitigation measures are recommended with the proposed Sheraton Maui Renovation Project. Improved traffic operations are anticipated at the Honoapiilani Highway/Kaanapali Parkway intersection with the construction of the Lahaina By-Pass Road.
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APPENDIX A

INFORMATION FROM THE
KAANAPALI BEACH HOTEL EXPANSION TRAFFIC IMPACT REPORT
FIGURE 2
EXISTING 1990 TRAFFIC VOLUMES

FIGURE 3
1993 BASE YEAR TRAFFIC VOLUMES
FIGURE 5
1993 WITH PROJECT TRAFFIC VOLUMES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>H1</th>
<th>I1</th>
<th>J1</th>
<th>K1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:30-3:35 PM</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:35-3:40 PM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:40-3:45 PM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45-3:50 PM</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:50-3:55 PM</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:55-4:00 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:05 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05-4:10 PM</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10-4:15 PM</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15-4:20 PM</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20-4:25 PM</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25-4:30 PM</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | 304 | 1522 | 220 | 2780 | 2 | 119 |    |    |    |    |    |

**approach/departure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>I2</th>
<th>J2</th>
<th>K2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:30-3:35 PM</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:35-3:40 PM</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:40-3:45 PM</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45-3:50 PM</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:50-3:55 PM</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:55-4:00 PM</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:05 PM</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05-4:10 PM</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10-4:15 PM</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15-4:20 PM</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20-4:25 PM</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25-4:30 PM</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | 1459 | 934 | 80 | 987 | 87 | 78 |    |    |    |    |    |
### APPENDIX B

#### LEVEL OF SERVICE DESCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT/STORM</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175-200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225-250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275-300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325-350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350-375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375-400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425-450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450-475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475-500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525-550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575-600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625-650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650-675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675-700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725-750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775-800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825-850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875-900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900-925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925-950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above represents various levels of service descriptions for different storm events and locations. The figures indicate specific criteria or values associated with each level of service.
LEVEL OF SERVICE DESCRIPTIONS

The Highway Capacity Manual defines six Levels of Service, labelled A through F, from best to worst conditions. Levels of Service for signalized and unsignalized intersections are defined in terms of average user delays. Delay is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time.

Unsignalized Intersections

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.

- **LEVEL OF SERVICE A**: Little or no delay.
- **LEVEL OF SERVICE B**: Short traffic delays.
- **LEVEL OF SERVICE C**: Average traffic delays.
- **LEVEL OF SERVICE D**: Long traffic delays.
- **LEVEL OF SERVICE E**: Very long traffic delays.
- **LEVEL OF SERVICE F**: Demand volume exceeds capacity, resulting in extreme delays with queuing that may cause severe congestion and affect other movements at the intersection.

Signalized Intersections

For signalized intersections, the Operational Analysis measures signal operations by two separate indicators, volume-to-capacity ratios (v/c) and Level of Service. The v/c ratios provide a comparison of the traffic demands to the theoretical capacity of the intersection while Levels of Service are determined from the estimated delay. These two indicators do not necessarily correlate to each other.

- **LEVEL OF SERVICE A**: This level describes operation with very low delay, i.e., less than 0.5 seconds per vehicle. This occurs when progression is extremely favorable, and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay.
- **LEVEL OF SERVICE B**: This level describes operation with delays in the range of 0.5 to 15.0 seconds per vehicle. This generally occurs with good progression and/or short cycle lengths. More vehicles stop than at Level of Service A, causing higher delays.
- **LEVEL OF SERVICE C**: This level describes operations with delays in the range of 15.1 to 25.0 seconds per vehicle. There are higher delays than at Level of Service B and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures (one vehicle may block the intersection) may begin to appear as the number of vehicles stopping is significant; many vehicles, however, still pass through the intersection without stopping.
- **LEVEL OF SERVICE D**: This level describes operations with delays in the range of 25.1 to 40.0 seconds per vehicle. At Level of Service D, the influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from a combination of unfavorable congestion, long cycle lengths, or high v/c ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable.
- **LEVEL OF SERVICE E**: This level describes operation with delays in the range of 40.1 to 60.0 seconds per vehicle. This is considered to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high v/c ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.
- **LEVEL OF SERVICE F**: This level describes operation with delay in excess of 60.0 seconds per vehicle. This is considered to be unacceptable to most drivers. This condition often occurs with over saturation, i.e., when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. It may also occur at v/c ratios below 1.00 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle length may also be major contributing causes to such delay levels.

Multilane Highways

For multilane highways, the Highway Capacity Manual defines Level of Service in terms of density. Density is a measure which quantifies the proximity to other vehicles in the traffic stream. It expresses the degree of maneuverability within the traffic stream.

Shannon and Holdren Equation: Final Traffic Assessment: Appendix D-4
LEVEL OF SERVICE A: This level describes completely free-flow conditions. The operation of vehicles is virtually unaffected by the presence of other vehicles, and operations are constrained only by geometric features of the highway and other preferences. Minor disruptions to flow are easily absorbed at this level without causing significant delays or queuing.

LEVEL OF SERVICE B: This level is also indicative of free flow, although the presence of other vehicles begins to be noticeable. Minor disruptions are still easily absorbed at this level, although local deterioration in Level of Service will be more obvious.

LEVEL OF SERVICE C: This level represents a range in which the influence of traffic density on operations becomes marked. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream, and to select an operating speed, is now clearly affected by the presence of other vehicles. Minor disruptions may be expected to cause serious local deterioration in service, and queues may form behind any significant traffic disruption. Severe or long-term disruptions may cause the facility to operate at Level of Service F.

LEVEL OF SERVICE D: This level borders on unstable flow. Speeds and ability to maneuver are severely restricted because of traffic congestion. Only the most minor of disruptions can be absorbed without the formation of extensive queues and the deterioration of service to Level of Service F.

LEVEL OF SERVICE E: This level represents operations at or near capacity, and is quite unstable. Disruptions cannot be dampened or dissipated, and any disruption, no matter how minor, will cause queues to form and service to deteriorate to Level of Service F.

LEVEL OF SERVICE F: This level represents forced or breakdown flow. It occurs at a point where vehicles arrive either at a rate greater than that at which they are discharged or at a point on a planned facility where forecasted demand exceeds the computed capacity.
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Preliminary Engineering Report

for the

Sheraton Maui Hotel Redevelopment

Kaanapali, Maui Hawaii

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the existing, and proposed drainage, water and sewer system for the redevelopment of the Sheraton Maui.

II. PROPOSED PROJECT

A. Location

The Sheraton Maui Hotel is located in the Kaanapali Beach Resort area along the Kaanapali Coast of Maui. The hotel site is located at the cul-de-sac of Kaanapali Parkway and is bounded on the south by Kaanapali Beach Hotel and on the north and west by the Pacific Ocean. It is identified by Tax Map Key: 4-4-08 : 4, 5 and 6 in Kaanapali, Maui, Hawaii.

B. Project Description

Existing Hotel

The Sheraton Maui consists of several multi-story buildings and 26 cottages with a total of 510 guest rooms. The Molokai Wing and Discovery Room are located on the northern boundary of the hotel and is adjacent to the Black Rock. The Cliff Tower adjoins the Discovery Room. The Garden Tower adjoins the Cliff Tower by way of the Promenade Deck. The main lobby fronts the porte-cochere and is adjacent to the Garden Tower. Twelve cottages are located on the south side of the hotel and the remaining fourteen cottages encompass the Garden Tower. Two paved parking areas, two swimming pools, a service yard and a luau area also occupy the 23.29 acre hotel site. Refer to Exhibit 3.
Renovated Hotel

The Sheraton Maui will undergo major renovation to restore it to a preeminent Hawaiian hotel that is distinctive among its peers. The Molokai Wing, the Cliff Tower and the Garden Tower will be renovated. The existing cottages will be demolished and replaced by the Seaside Village. Although there will be an increase of modules, the amount of guest rooms will still remain the same.

The existing floor area of restaurants and meeting rooms as well as areas of the food and beverage, and function supports will increase. The service areas, laundry/valet, engineering, administrative offices, etc. will be renovated and increased in size. The existing parking lot adjacent to Kaanapali Parkway will be demolished and replaced with a multi-story parking complex. The landscaping will be redone to include lagoons and additional swimming pools throughout the entire hotel site. The existing porte-cochere and main lobby will be replaced by a ramped entry drive and lobby at the 30 ft. elevation. The proposed renovation is shown on Exhibit 4.

III. EXISTING CONDITIONS

A. Topography and Soil Conditions

The terrain of the property generally slopes at 1 to 10 percent in various directions. The area described as Black Rock is located atop a cliff at the northwestern boundary of the property. The elevations on the site range from 9 feet at the Main Lobby to 73 feet MSL (mean sea level) at the Discovery Room at the top of Black Rock.

The soil classification of the site is described as Jaucas sand (JaC) by the USDA Soil Conservation Service ("Soil Survey of the Islands of Kauai, Oahu, Maui, Molokai and Lanai"). The single grain, sandy soil has a slope of 0 to 15 percent. Permeability is rapid and runoff is very slow to slow. The hazard of water erosion is slight.

B. Flood Zone

The Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for the area indicates that the site lies within Zone C, A4 and V12. The majority of the site is situated in Zone C, which is an area of minimal flooding. Areas along the shoreline are close to Zone A4, which is an area of 100-year flood. The canal is situated in Zone V12, which is an area of 100-year flood with velocity (wave action). Refer to Exhibit 5.
The buildings for the proposed redevelopment lie within Zone "C" and is therefore in an area of minimal flooding.

C. Drainage System

At present, storm runoff generated from the existing hotel flows in several directions. More than half of the storm runoff generated from the hotel sheet flows into the ocean. Storm runoff at the cottages percolate into low spots at grassed area. Storm runoff from the parking area, tennis courts, porte cochere and the service entry road are intercepted by an underground drainage collection system on Kaanapali Parkway. The underground drainage collection system discharges storm runoff into the canal through a 42-inch outlet. A total of 78 cfs (cubic feet per second) of storm runoff is generated by the existing hotel. Refer to Exhibits 6 and 8.

D. Water System

The water system is owned and operated by Kaanapali Water Corp., a subsidiary of Amfac Property Investment Corp. Potable, fire protection and irrigation water for developed areas, other than irrigation water for the golf courses, is provided by the system.

The water source is basal groundwater obtained from four deep wells, the Honokowai Well B and the Mahinahina Wells P-4, P-5 and P-6. These four wells have a total design capacity of 5.4 million gallons per day (MGD) and have a current pumping rate of 4.28 MGD with an unused capacity of 1.12 MGD. The Hanakakoo Wells P-1 and P-2 and Honokowai Well A will provide an additional 2.52 MGD and are expected to be operational within the next two years.

Water is stored within three 1.5 MG reservoirs. The Puukolii and Kaanapali Reservoirs are located at the mauka end of Puukolii Road. The third reservoir is located mauka of the South Course of the Royal Kaanapali Golf Course.

The transmission system is comprised of 12-inch and 16 inch cast iron and ductile iron pipes between the wells and reservoirs and from the reservoirs to each of the developed areas of Kaanapali.

A 16-inch and 12-inch pipeline crosses Honopilani Highway to service the Kaanapali Resort area. A 12-inch pipeline located along Kaanapali Parkway provides service to the Sheraton Maui. Refer to Exhibit 8.
A total of seven fire hydrants are located within the bounds of the hotel. Three fire hydrants are located on Kaanapali Parkway fronting the hotel. Two fire hydrants are located along the access road to the service area. A fire hydrant is located on the south side of the hotel along the beach access walkway. The seventh fire hydrant is located behind the main lobby and tennis courts.

Water for hotel domestic use is metered through a 3-inch and a 6-inch meter. The 3-inch meter is located at the south side of the hotel fronting Kaanapali Parkway and provides service to the luau cottages (Rooms 2600 to 3600). The 6-inch meter is located at the entrance of the Service Area and supplies the Garden Tower, the Cliff Tower, the Molokai Wing, the Discovery Room, cottages, landscape irrigation and pools.

The hotel's water consumption for each month of 1992 is shown on Table I. The tabulation includes water use for landscape irrigation, swimming pools and laundry.

The water consumption at full occupancy is 353,100 gallons per day (gpd). Approximately 123,000 gpd of water is used for landscape irrigation and swimming pools with the balance of 230,100 gpd used for domestic supply. The average daily demand for the present hotel is 450 gpd per occupied guest room.

E. Wastewater System

The County sewerage system within the Kaanapali Resort area along Honoapiilani Highway, consists of 27-inch gravity trunk lines, two pump stations (No. 1 and No. 2), 20-inch force mains and the 6.7 million gallons per day (mgd) capacity Lahaina Sewage Treatment Plant. Sewage from Lahaina is conveyed along Honoapiilani Highway via the force mains and gravity lines and is combined with flow from the Kaanapali Resort area as it flows toward the Lahaina Sewage Treatment Plant near Honokowai Stream.

Both County pump stations (i.e., Nos. 1 and 2) are equipped with three 2,500 gallons per minute (gpm) pumps, in which two pumps are "on-line" (5,000 gpm or 7.2 mgd capacity), while the third pump acts as standby.

The system was originally designed to serve the sewage requirements of future developments in Lahaina, with an Average Daily Flow of 3.2 and a Peak Flow capacity of 7.2 mgd.
In the early 1980's, Amfac Property Investment Corp. initiated a 3.5 mgd expansion of the then existing 3.2 mgd Lahaina Sewage Treatment Plant to accommodate anticipated future growth in Kaanapali. The plant expansion, which was completed in 1985, increased the total treatment plant capacity to 6.7 mgd. Under an agreement with the County, Amfac paid for the plant expansion and dedicated the improvements to the County, while maintaining a 3.16 mgd allocation of the treatment plant capacity, which excludes flows from Kaanapali Hillside and The Masters.

Wastewater for the existing Sheraton Maui is carried by one 6-inch and two 8-inch laterals. Refer to Exhibit 8. The 6-inch lateral provides service to the Luau Cottage area. An 8-inch lateral services the central area of the hotel. The other 8-inch lateral provides service to the Black Rock area. These three laterals carry the wastewater to a 15-inch County sewerline on Kaanapali Parkway. The sewage is conveyed to pump stations located along the Royal Kaanapali Golf Course. It is then pumped up to Sewage Pump Station No. 2, located on the mauka side of Honoapiilani Highway. From Pump Station No. 2, the sewage is conveyed to Sewage Pump Station No. 1 by way of a 20-inch force main and a 27-inch gravity line. From Pump Station No. 1 the sewage is pumped to the Lahaina Sewage Treatment Plant. The wastewater generated by the Sheraton Maui is provided on Table II. Based on the information provided on Table II, 334,800 gpd of wastewater is generated during full occupancy by the 510 guest room hotel.

IV. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

A. Grading Plan

The proposed grading plan will require excavation and embankment for the construction of the parking structure, the Seaside Village, entry to the new lobby and the additional swimming pools and lagoons. The site will be graded to dispose of the onsite storm runoff generated from this redevelopment.

Erosion control measures will be incorporated during the construction period to minimize soil loss. Graded areas will be hydromulched and watered for dust control.
B. Drainage Plan

The proposed drainage plan will consist of an underground drainage collection system which will convey onsite runoff to the existing system on Kaanapali Parkway. Storm runoff from the Black Rock area and the shoreline area will flow into the ocean and canal. Storm runoff from new lobby, thr Seaside Village and the parking structure will be collected by an on-site underground drainage collection system which will be intercepted by the drainage system at Kaanapali Parkway. Refer to Exhibit 7.

C. Hydrology

The Rational Method as described in the "Storm Drainage Standards", May 1988, by the City and County of Honolulu was used to compute the storm runoff quantity. Runoff calculations were based on a 10-year storm recurrence interval. The rainfall intensity was interpolated from the "Rainfall Frequency Atlas of the Hawaiian Islands", by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau.

The existing onsite storm runoff for the 10-year storm event is approximately 78 cubic feet per second (cfs). The storm runoff for the renovated hotel site is projected at 88 cfs. There will be approximately a 10 percent increase in impervious ground area with less open space. Refer to the Appendix for site drainage calculations.

D. Water System

The proposed redevelopment will maintain the 510 guest rooms. Three of these guest rooms will consist of two bath suites for a total estimated domestic flow of 230,900 gpd, and increase of 800 gpd from existing domestic usage. The landscape area will decrease, while the swimming pool and lagoon area will increase for a total estimated flow of 124,200 gpd, an increase of 1,200 gpd over existing non-domestic usage. The total estimated average daily demand for the proposed renovation with full occupancy is 355,100 gpd, an increase of about 2,000 gpd (about 0.5 percent) over existing usage.

E. Wastewater System

The proposed redevelopment will generate a total estimated wastewater flow of 336,900 gpd during full occupancy. This represents a 200 gpd increase (0.6 percent) over existing flows. Construction plans and calculations will be submitted to the Department of Public Works, County of Maui, for approval.
V. CONCLUSION

The proposed grading and drainage plans for the Sheraton Maui Redevelopment will be designed to produce no adverse effects by storm runoff to adjacent properties. All drainage improvements will conform to the County Standard and will be coordinated with the Department of Public Works, County of Maui.

Water and sewer systems will be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Water Supply, State Department of Health and the Department of Public Works.
### TABLE I

**Daily Water Usage:**

**Maui Sheraton Hotel**

(Gallons Per Day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>237,828</td>
<td>214,680</td>
<td>232,697</td>
<td>148,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>249,586</td>
<td>182,200</td>
<td>211,771</td>
<td>255,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>209,200</td>
<td>224,000</td>
<td>204,036</td>
<td>319,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>239,185</td>
<td>216,259</td>
<td>205,357</td>
<td>259,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>259,950</td>
<td>242,029</td>
<td>232,686</td>
<td>241,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>222,826</td>
<td>251,636</td>
<td>240,643</td>
<td>316,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>318,786</td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>250,357</td>
<td>254,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>274,414</td>
<td>298,278</td>
<td>267,171</td>
<td>277,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>353,059</td>
<td>309,037</td>
<td>289,899</td>
<td>333,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>242,929</td>
<td>299,786</td>
<td>270,686</td>
<td>258,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>292,286</td>
<td>268,829</td>
<td>266,500</td>
<td>236,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>241,258</td>
<td>277,478</td>
<td>248,321</td>
<td>283,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar</td>
<td>201,458</td>
<td>205,597</td>
<td>253,500</td>
<td>234,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-May</td>
<td>249,333</td>
<td>252,667</td>
<td>228,393</td>
<td>220,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-July</td>
<td>267,800</td>
<td>293,623</td>
<td>213,951</td>
<td>223,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-Sept</td>
<td>283,581</td>
<td>284,079</td>
<td>334,839</td>
<td>289,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept-Nov</td>
<td>267,267</td>
<td>263,417</td>
<td>258,279</td>
<td>396,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-Jan</td>
<td>260,483</td>
<td>188,590</td>
<td>270,806</td>
<td>236,323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE II**

Wastewater Flow:

Sheraton Maui Hotel

(Gallons Per Day)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (A)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>0.009</th>
<th>0.010</th>
<th>0.011</th>
<th>0.012</th>
<th>0.013</th>
<th>0.014</th>
<th>0.015</th>
<th>0.016</th>
<th>0.017</th>
<th>0.018</th>
<th>0.019</th>
<th>0.020</th>
<th>0.021</th>
<th>0.022</th>
<th>0.023</th>
<th>0.024</th>
<th>0.025</th>
<th>0.026</th>
<th>0.027</th>
<th>0.028</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.290</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.355</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Drainage Area (Acres)</th>
<th>A.s.</th>
<th>Runoff Coefficient, C</th>
<th>Rainfall Intensity, I (in./hr.)</th>
<th>L (ft.)</th>
<th>Q = CIA * (CFS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>640</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>470</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Accumulated Q, (CFS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koff Int. Obs</td>
<td>26.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koff Int. Obs</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koff Int. Obs</td>
<td>11.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koff Int. Obs</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koff Int. Obs</td>
<td>55.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.75</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference:
REFERENCES

1. John Robinson, Sheraton Maui Hotel.
Appendix F
Agency Pre-Consultation Letters
APPENDIX F: AGENCY PRECONSULTATION LETTERS

During preparation of the Draft Environmental Assessment, pre-consultation packages were sent to the following agencies. The written agency responses are reproduced in this Appendix.

County
#County of Maui Planning Department
#Department of Water Supply
#Department of Public Works, Land Use and Codes Administration
#Department of Parks and Recreation
#Department of Human Concerns

State
#Department of Health (Honolulu and Maui)
#Department of Transportation, Highways
#Department of Land and Natural Resources
#Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Division

Federal
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service
#Dept. of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Other
#Maui Electric Company

# Indicates comment letter received
Miss Leslie Koralski  
Project Planner  
Heller Hastei and Fee, Planners  
733 Bishop Street, Suite 2590  
Honolulu, Hawaii  96813

Dear Ms. Koralski:

We have received your letter dated March 8, 1993 regarding the Sheraton Maui Hotel redevelopment. The summary information package was reviewed.

Any work in waters of the U.S. will require a Department of the Army (DA) permit. Renovations to existing piers will require a DA permit.

File No. PO 93-042 has been assigned to your project. Please refer to this number in future correspondence. Should you have any questions on this matter, please contact the Operations Division at 438-9258.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael T. Lee  
Chief, Operations Division

---

Mr. Leslie Koralski  
Project Manager  
Heller Hastei & Fee  
733 Bishop Street, Suite 2590  
Honolulu, Hawaii  96813

Dear Mr. Koralski:

Subject: Early Assessment  
Sheraton Maui Hotel Redevelopment  
Kaanapali Beach, Maui, Hawaii

Thank you for allowing us to review and comment on the subject project. We have the following comments to offer:

Wastewater:

The subject project is located within the County sewer service system. As the area is sewered, we have no objections to the proposed redevelopment, consisting of upgrading existing facilities to new federal, state and county code requirements, as well as improve the aesthetic and functional aspects of the hotel, provided that the project is connected to the public sewers.

The developer should work closely with the County to assure the availability of additional treatment capacity and adequacy for the project. Run availability of treatment capacity will not be an acceptable justification for use of any private treatment works.

If you should have any questions, please contact Ms. Lori Kajimura of the Wastewater Branch at 586-4290.

Due to preliminary plans being the sole source of discussion, we reserve the right to impose future environmental restrictions on the project when more detailed information is submitted.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

John G. Lemhi, M.D.  
Director of Health

cc: Wastewater Branch
March 17, 1993

Helena Hastert and Fee, Planners
333 Bishop Street, Suite 2090
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Leslie Kuriaki

Dear Sir:

Subject: Sheraton Maui Hotel Redevelopment, Kaanapali Beach, Maui, Hawaii

Due to the general nature of your project summary, we are unable to make any specific comments at this time. However, the proposed project must comply with all applicable rules and requirements of the Health Department relating to food, swimming pool, and other health-related activities. We reserve the right to review and approve the detail plan when it becomes available.

Should you have further questions, please call Mr. David H. Nakagawa, Chief Sanitarian, Maui District Health Office, at 243-5255.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

JOSEPH J. SOBOTKA, M.D.
Acting District Health Services Administrator
Mr. Leslie Kuriaiki, Project Planner
Heller, Natart and Pee, Planners
顺水丸中心, E. Tower
733 Bishop Street, Suite 2500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Kuriaiki:

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for Redevelopment, Rainbow, Hawaii, DKR-5-4-0-88-5

We have reviewed the preliminary EA information for the proposed redevelopment project transmitted by your letter dated March 6, 1993, and have the following comments:

Brief Description:

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing 594-room hotel while maintaining the existing low density character of the area. The redevelopment involves two components: the demolition of existing facilities, and the demolition and construction of new structures and facilities.

The proposal also includes a concept design for renovation of an old pier located on the northern end of the property. The pier could serve as a staging area for future commercial and recreational boating activities. The applicant is willing to participate with the state and other structures. However, it does not intend to take the lead in renovation of the old pier.

Division of Aquatic Resources

The Division of Aquatic Resources (DAR) comments that the applicant's request for the proposed renovation of existing hotel facilities, and the demolition and construction of new structures and facilities is not expected to have significant adverse impact on aquatic resource values due to the site already being extensively developed. However, since the proposed project is adjacent to the nearshore waters which are popular for sport diving, additional mitigation measures should be provided to minimize erosion and siltation including:

1. Site work should be scheduled for periods of minimal rainfall;
2. Lands devoid of vegetation should be replanted or covered as quickly as possible to control erosion;
3. Construction materials, petroleum products, debris and landscaping products should be protected from falling, blowing or leaking into the aquatic environment.

DAR suggests the applicant's proposal of providing a 20-car parking lot for the public along the southern portion of the property adjacent to the Rainbow Beach Hotel. This represents an increase from the existing five parking stalls and would provide additional parking at the public beach access.

Division of Land Management

The Division of Land Management (DLR) comments that they would like more information regarding possible pier renovation when the Draft EA is submitted.

The past, people, usually local, have complained that the area has been chosen for off when they have tried to fish, sail, or dive off the old pier at the north end of the property.

Before the State agrees to participate in the pier restoration, DLR should inform DAR of the extent of their plans for access to, and parking for pier users. DLR assumes that recreational boating will need trailer parking and recognizes that fisherman do not appreciate the long walk from the public parking lots on the southern end of the property.

DLR believes that a 20-car parking lot for public beach parking is, or soon would be, inadequate and that more should be provided.
Mr. L. Hartwell

Other improvements to consider:

1. A "yield" sign. This may be used at intersections along the certified
   roadways that are suitable to public access. It should also be used
   where there are potential conflicts between the public and private
   uses of the property, to increase the size of their property.

The Division of State Parks does not make provision for public access
   into private property. However, it is hoped that the public can use the
   roads that run through the property, as a part of the
   Natural Protection Division.

We urge you to submit comments on this matter.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.

Please feel free to contact your local Park Ranger at our Office of Recreation and

Environmental Affairs, at 501-4031, should you have any questions.

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]
April 6, 1993

Mr. Leslie Kurashiki, Project Planner
Massey Hastings & Feo
Grosvener Center, 1310 Bishop
733 Bishop Street, Suite 2590
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Kurashiki:

SUBJECT: Historic Preservation Review of the Proposed Sheraton Maui Hotel Redevelopment

Kamaole, Kahului, Maui

Thank you for meeting with Ms. Anna Griffin, Staff Archaeologist, handling Maui County, regarding this proposed development. This letter responds to your letter of March 8, 1993 and summarizes our concerns and recommendations made at the meeting.

As was pointed out in a previous meeting with Mr. Grant Morikami of your office, the rocky point at the western portion of this parcel was traditionally called Lelua-o-ha-ka, the 'leaping place of the soul.' It is listed in our inventory of historic places as site 1126. Traditional accounts also mention bloody battles to have occurred in the vicinity and that the area contained human bones. The sandy beach on which most of the hotel facilities are located is probably the likely location for the burial ground, if present. We are not aware of any archaeological study done when the existing hotel facilities were built between 20 to 30 years ago, so the presence or absence of a burial site on this property has not been determined. However, we have received unconfirmed oral reports that burials were discovered when the Garden Tower was built. Therefore, we believe that an inventory survey in the form of subsurface testing by backhoe should be conducted to determine the presence or absence of significant historic sites (cultural deposits and/or burials).

Leslie Kurashiki
Page

The proposed redevelopment was presented at your meeting with Ms. Griffin and the areas that will require excavations below grade were identified. Three areas were recommended by Ms. Griffin for subsurface testing. We also prefer that the testing be completed prior to the completion of the Draft Environmental Assessment Report, and filing of the Section 106 Permit Application. It is important for significant historic sites to be identified, if present, at an early stage so that their appropriate treatment can be determined during permit review.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Griffin at 587-0013.

Sincerely,

Leslie Kurashiki
Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division

AGRI
March 31, 1993

Ms. Leilani Kurisaki
Project Planner
Hilton Hawaiian Village
733 Bishop Street, Suite 2590
Honolulu, Hawaii  96813

Dear Ms. Kurisaki:

Subject: Sheraton Kauai Hotel Redevelopment

Thank you for your letter dated March 8, 1993 and the project summary of the proposed redevelopment.

We recommend consulting the Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Boating and Ocean Recreation (DLNR-BOR) about the possible repairs to the old pier.

Should there be any questions, please contact Calvin Taoda, Deputy Director for Harbors at 587-1918.

Sincerely,

Rex D. Johnson
Director of Transportation

DLNR-BOR
Ms. Leslie Kurisaki
March 31, 1993

Dear Ms. Kurisaki,

RE: Pre-Agency Consultation for the Sheraton Maui Renovation
Environmental Assessment, DM 1-4-8-5, Kaanapali, Maui.

The Planning Department has reviewed the Project Summary dated March 1993 for the Sheraton Maui Hotel Redevelopment and has the following comments to offer:

1. The project will be subject to both the Special Management Area and Shoreline Setback Rules and Regulations. As part of the project submittal, a current shoreline certification map will be required. The issue of the reconstructed Moalau Wing may be an area of concern from this department and shall be evaluated pursuant to the Shoreline Setback Rules.

2. Regarding public access to shoreline resources, consideration should be given to the continuation of the lateral beach walkway along the entire shoreline boundary. Also public beach access parking should be addressed by the application.

3. If the historic pier area is to be restored, provisions for public access should be provided and incorporated into the project plans.

4. In order to analyze visual impacts of the project, the application submittal should include view studies from adjacent properties as well as from Kainapali Parkway.

5. As part of the Environmental Assessment Report, additional information pertaining to traffic, drainage, historic and cultural resources, sewer, water, public facilities, etc. will be addressed in detail.

At this time we are providing general comments for your information. The Planning Department will analyze your project during the Special Management Area Use Permit and Shoreline Setback Variance process and make a recommendation to the Maui Planning Commission once all relative information has been gathered.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. If further clarification is required, please contact this office.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

[Name]
Director of Planning

cc: Clayton Yoshida
Colleen Suyama
Ann Chu
April 15, 1993

Mr. Leslie Kuriliski
Holber Hartert and Fee, Planners
733 Bishop Street, Suite 2390
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Kuriliski:

Subject: Sheraton Maui Hotel Redevelopment
Kaanapali Beach, Maui, Hawaii

Pursuant to your request on March 6, 1993, we have reviewed the summary project information on the proposed Sheraton Maui Hotel redevelopment. However, because it is in summary form, we request that you either meet with us or submit comments on the project's plans detailing the public beach access and parking lot.

Thank you for allowing us to comment on the project summary information pertaining to the forthcoming Draft Environmental Assessment. If you have any questions, please call Roxanne Teshima at 243-7967.

Sincerely,

CHARMAINE TAVARES
Director

CTirt

D. CROCKETT LEWIS
Manager

Tropical Padda

ARMANDO PADILLA
Supervisor

HERBERT HASTERT
Planners

23 April 1993

Mr. Charmaime Tawnees, Director
Department of Parks and Recreation
County of Maui
1500 Kahului Avenue
Wailuku, Maui 96793

Re: Sheraton Maui Hotel Redevelopment
Your letter dated April 13, 1993

Dear Mr. Tawnees:

Thank you for your letter in response to the project summary sent to you on the Sheraton Maui Hotel Redevelopment. Your letter indicated that you wanted additional information on the project. In a subsequent conversation with Roxanne Teshima of your office on Thursday, April 22, she indicated to us that you had several specific concerns regarding the public beach access and parking:

1) Public Beach Access. The project will not change or modify the existing public beach access which exits along the Sheraton Maui's southern property line.

2) Beach Parking Lot. The project will create a new public beach parking lot on the property at Kaanapali Parkway, adjacent to the public beach access. There is no public beach parking lot at present. The proposed lot will have 20 parking spaces (including one handicapped stall) and parking will be free.

In its approval of a Special Management Area Use Permit for the renovation of the adjacent Kaanapali Beach Hotel on December 20, 1990, the Maui County Planning Commission required "a minimum of sixteen (16) compact beach parking spaces", which established a rate of one public beach stall per 28 hotel rooms (1:28). The beach parking stalls proposed for the Sheraton Maui Hotel redevelopment increase this ratio to one stall per 25 rooms (1:25), a ten percent increase over what was required for the Kaanapali Beach Hotel.

We hope that this information addresses your specific concerns. If you have any questions or need additional information please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

HERBERT HASTERT & SIE, Planners

Leslie Kuriliski
Project Planner

Herbert Hartert & Fee
1500 Bishop Street, Suite 2390
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813

Telephone: 808-547-2155
Facsimile: 808-547-2922
Ms. Leslie Kurianski

Project Planner
Holman Hackett and Poe, Planners
733 Bishop Street, Suite 2590
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

April 1, 1993

Dear Ms. Kurianski:

Subject: Sheraton Maui Hotel Redevelopment

We have reviewed your March 9, 1993 letter to Mr. Edwin Okubo of our Housing Division and the Project Summary for the subject project, and would like to offer the following comments:

1. The project summary states that the proposed redevelopment of the Sheraton Maui Hotel will not increase the number of hotel rooms. That being the case, the proposed project fails under the provisions of Section 14.64.650 of the Maui County Code, and is excluded from the County's affordable housing policies for hotel-related developments.

2. How many full-time and part-time employees are currently employed at the Sheraton Maui Hotel, and will some or all of the employees be laid-off during the one-year redevelopment period?

3. For those employees who are laid-off during the one-year redevelopment period, what are the arrangements for their re-employment, continuation of job seniority and continuation of retirement benefits?

4. The proposed 20 parking stalls for public beach parking is not adequate and should be increased significantly. Please consult with the Department of Planning for their determination of the adequate number of public beach parking stalls.

5. Please contact the Department of Public Works, Land Use & Code Administration concerning any requirements in providing parking stalls designed for public beach access accessible to the handicapped and disabled.

6. Shower and restroom facilities should be provided in the vicinity of the public beach access (near the beach).

Please contact Mr. Edwin Okubo or Mr. Wayne Oshiro at 243-1351 should you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

STEPHANIE SAUYERID
Director of Housing and Human Concerns

WTO:df

xc: Housing Administrator
Director of Planning
Helen Hoshida
Planner

20 April 1993
Ms. Stephanie Aveiro, Director
Department of Human Concerns
County of Maui
300 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Re: Sheraton Maui Hotel Renovation
Your letter dated April 1, 1993

Dear Ms. Aveiro:

Thank you for your letter providing comments to the proposed Sheraton Maui Hotel renovation. In response to your comments:

Comment 2. The Sheraton Maui hotel currently has a total of 318 employees, 310 full-time, 27 part-time and 1 on-call employees. During the renovation period, it is anticipated that all but approximately eight of the management staff would be laid off. Depending on the contractor's requirements, there could be another 10 to 15 employees retained to do project security work.

Comment 3. Employees would be considered to be on temporary layoffs during the renovation period. The hotel would be extending the existing labor agreement with the approval of the Union, to provide the necessary reemployment, seniority and retirement benefit protection. Employees willing to relocate would also be considered for suitable openings that may arise at other Sheraton Hotels in Hawaii.

Comment 4. A meeting with the Maui County Planning Department director and staff was held in March 1993 to discuss the project. At that time, the Planning Department indicated that there were no County standards for public beach parking, and that the 20 spaces provided was sufficient.

In its approved of a Special Management Area Use Permit Application for the proposed renovation of the adjacent Kama'alu Beach Hotel on December 20, 1990, the Maui County Planning Commission required a "minimum of six (6) compact beach parking spaces...". This established a ratio of one public beach stall per 28 hotel rooms (1/28). The 20 beach parking stalls proposed by the Sheraton Maui Hotel redevelopment increases this ratio to one stall per 21 rooms (1/21), a ten percent increase over what was required for the Kama'alu Beach Hotel.

Finally, as mentioned to you recently by Mr. Jim Cochet, of the Sheraton Maui, in addition to the 20 stall beach parking lot, the hotel will have additional parking for 50 or more cars which beach goers will be able to utilize. However, this overflow capacity will be paid parking.

Comment 5. At your suggestion, we followed up with the County Land Use and Codes Administration on requirements for parking and public beach access. Land Use and Codes indicated that the County did not enforce Federal Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines.

According to Mr. Ben Group of the States Commission on Persons With Disabilities, there are currently no guidelines in place for recreational facilities (e.g., beach access). Recreational guidelines are currently being developed and should be in place by 1995. However, beach parking, as part of the hotel site, is subject to ADA guidelines for handicapped-accessible parking. He indicated that for the proposed 20 spaces, one should be handicapped accessible. Accordingly, one of the 20 stalls will be handicapped accessible.

Comment 6. Showers for beach users are and will continue to be available on the beach. Presently, many beach-goers utilize the hotel restroom facilities.

Thank you again for taking the time to provide comments on the project.

Sincerely,

Helen Hoshida
Planner

cc: Wayne Judd, ITT Sheraton
Jim Cochet, Sheraton Maui
Kevin Chrost/Eugene Watanabe, WATG
March 23, 1993

Mr. Leslie Kuriaki, Project Planner
Kelber Bastert and Fee, Planners
733 Bishop Street, Suite 2590
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Kuriaki:

Subject: Sheraton Waikiki Hotel Redevelopment
Kaanapali Beach, Maui, Hawaii

Thank you for allowing us to comment on the subject project.

In reviewing the information transmitted and our records, we need additional data to determine what impact the additional load will have on our distribution system. We encourage the developer’s electrical consultant to meet with us as soon as practical to plan for the proposed project’s electrical requirements. In addition, our records show the existing service to the Sheraton as a primary service at 12.47KV. Therefore, the requirements for the metering might have to be upgraded depending on the amount of additional load. Given the long lead time for electrical service equipment, we cannot emphasize enough the need to meet with the developer’s electrical consultant as soon as possible to verify the project’s electrical requirements so that service can be provided on a timely basis.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call Dan Takahata at 871-2385.

Sincerely,

Edward E. Reischardt
Manager of Engineering

An HEC Company
Appendix G
Comments Received on
Draft Environmental Assessment
APPENDIX G: COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

This Appendix contains reproductions of letters received in response to the Draft Environmental Assessment. Copies of the Draft EA were sent to the following agencies:

County

County of Maui Planning Department
#Department of Water Supply
#Department of Public Works, Land Use and Codes Administration
#Department of Parks and Recreation
#Department of Human Concerns
#Police Department
#Fire Department

State

#Department of Health (Honolulu and Maui)
#Department of Transportation, Highways
Department of Transportation, Harbors
#Department of Land and Natural Resources,
State Historic Preservation Division
#Department of Accounting and General Services (Survey Division)
Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism
#Department of Labor and Industrial Relations

Federal

#Dept. of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Other

#Maui Electric Company

# Indicates comment letter received
MEMO TO: Brian N. Hickox, Planning Director  
FROM: George N. Ahia, Director of Public Works  
SUBJECT: Special Management Area Use Permit and Shoreline-Setback Variance Applications  
SHERATON MAUI REDEVELOPMENT  
TMS# 4-6-6-10  93/EA-10, 93/GSV-6, 93/SM1-26

August 30, 1993

No review of the subject application and have the following comments:
1. Comments from the Engineering Division:
   a. No comments.
2. Comments from the Wastewater Reclamation Division:
   a. The developer will be required to obtain any additional wastewater capacity through AWAC's reserve allocation.
   b. Wastewater contribution calculations are required before building permit is issued. A detailed wastewater flow calculation is required to substantiate current and project wastewater flows.
   c. Developer is required to fund any necessary off-site improvements to collection system and wastewater pump stations.

The applicant is requested to contact the Wastewater Reclamation Division at 243-7417 for additional information.

Mr. Brian Hickox  
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August 30, 1993  
TMS# 4-6-6-10  93/EA-10, 93/GSV-6, 93/SM1-26

3. Comments from the Solid Waste Division:
   a. The owners and their contractors shall implement solid waste reduction, re-use and recycling program to reduce the amount of solid waste to be disposed of at the County landfill.
   b. All yard debris shall be composted and re-used on their landscape plantings.
   c. Alternative means of disposal of grubbed material and rock shall be utilized rather than disposed of at the County landfill.
   d. Refuse collection shall be by a private collector.

The applicant is requested to contact the Solid Waste Division at 243-7875 for additional information.

4. Comments from the Land Use and Codes Administration:
   a. A detailed drainage and erosion control plan, to include, but not limited to, hydrologic and hydraulic calculations, scheme for controlling erosion and disposal of runoff water is required, and an analysis of the soil loss using the HEC-HMS erosion formula, must be submitted for our review and approval. The plan should provide verification that the grading and runoff water generated by the project will not have an adverse effect on the adjacent and downstream properties.

The applicant is requested to contact the Land Use and Codes Administration at 243-7875 for additional information.
September 28, 1993

Mr. George N. Kaye, Director
County of Maui
Department of Public Works and Waste Management
214 South High Street
Wailuku, Maui, HI 96793

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment Plan
Environmental Assessment
TMK 4-4-06-05
Your Memo to Maui County Planning Dept., August 30, 1993

Dear Mr. Kaye:

Thank you for your memo to the Maui County Planning Department, dated August 30, 1993, commenting on the above referenced project. Your comments have been forwarded to the project developer, architect and civil engineer. After review of your comments, we offer the following responses:

Wastewater Reclamation Division

The design team is studying methods of reducing project wastewater flows through the implementation of an aggressive water conservation program. This program package will include, but not be limited to, flow restrictions, UFL type fixtures where technically feasible and possibly some wastewater (gray water) reuse, if the appropriate permits and technology are available.

The project civil engineers will provide wastewater contribution and detailed wastewater flow calculations as required.

Solid Waste Division

a. ITT Sheraton operates the most aggressive recycling and source reduction program of any hotel company in Hawaii at its Waikiki properties. It is the intent of ITT Sheraton to extend these programs to the outer islands, including Maui, as soon as the various counties develop the infrastructure to recycle the various colors of glass, cardboard, paper, etc. Aluminum is currently recycled. A refrigerated garbage room is being planned to allow the recycling of wet kitchen waste by local farmers. Hopefully, an outlet for this reusable kitchen waste can be found.

b. Yard debris shall be chipped and reused as mulch and compost.

c. This comment has been passed on to the contractor for their action.

d. Refuse collection will be by a private contractor.
September 27, 1993

Mr. Brian Mikes, Director
Planning Department
290 S. High Street
Wailuku, HI 96793

Subject: L.D. No.: 83/EA-10, 83/SSV-05, 83/SM1-26
TMK 4-4-08:05; Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
Applicant: Kyo-yu Company, Ltd.

Dear Mr. Mikes:

We have reviewed the subject plans and have no further comments to offer at this time. The applicant has addressed our concern on the beach access parking lot. The proposed lot will have twenty stalls, including one handicapped stall with fee public parking.

Thank you for allowing us to comment on applications.

Sincerely,

CHARMAINE TAVARES
Director

CT/1t

September 29, 1993

Mr. Charnaine Tavares, Director
Department of Parks and Recreation
County of Maui
1380 Kaahumanu Ave.
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
Draft Environmental Assessment
TMK 4-4-08:05
Your Letter to Maui County Planning Dept., September 27, 1993

Dear Mr. Tavares:

Thank you for your letter to the Maui County Planning Department, dated September 27, 1993, responding to the request for comments on the above referenced Draft EA.

We note that you have no further comments on the proposed project, and that the applicant has addressed your concern on the beach access parking lot.

We appreciate your review of the EA.

Sincerely,

HELBER NASTERT & FERI, Planners

Leslie Kusinski
Project Planner

cc: Brian Mikes, Maui County Planning Director
Wayne Holt, SST Sheraton
Shoji Yasu, Kyo-yu Company, Ltd.
Kevin Chun, WATG
RECEIVED

DOH 23 P253
COUNTY OF MAUNA

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

TO: STATE AGENCIES

XX DOT Maui
XX DOT Hnl
XX DOT Waipio
XX DOT Harbors
XX DOT Airports
XX DHR/Meas Hlth Div
XX DLNR (2 Copies)
XX Dept of Agriculture
XX Dept of Commerce
XX Dept/Half of Bus Serv
XX DAGS (Survey Division)
XX DEB
XX Dept of Human Serv
XX Office of Tax Affairs
XX Dept of Labor

xx Project Agencies:
XX HAPA (3 Copies)
XX DMA (Human Concerns)
XX Fire Dept
XX Police Dept
XX Corp Counsel

xx County Agencies:
XX Army Corps of Engineers
XX Soil Conservation Service
XX Maun Services
XX Maui Electric Company

SUBJECT: I.D. No. 92/EA-16, 92/BPA-06, 92/PAI-04
Projects: GOGO KAI REDEVELOPMENT
Applicant: Kyo-ya Company, Ltd.

TRANSMITTED TO YOU ARE THE FOLLOWING:
XX Application
XX Project Plans
XX Environmental Assessment
XX Archaeology Report
XX Shallow Water (LUA), DLNR
XX Soils Report
XX Drainage Report
XX Draft Ordinance(s)
XX Unilateral Agreement(s)

THOSE ARE TRANSMITTED AS CHECKED BELOW:
XX For Your Comment/Recommendation

Remarks:
If additional information is required please contact Mr. 242-7739.

CLAYTON WATANABE, BCPW
For BRIAN KERBE, Planning Director

BCC:
Colleen Sugawa, Current Planning Division Chief
Wayne Judd, ITT Sheraton
Leslie Murasaki, Hober Hospitality & Fee
Clayton Yoshida, AICP
Charlies Jonske, BW

August 23, 1992

2200 MAUNA HALU
COUNTY OF MAUNA
"MAUNA PLANNING DEPARTMENT"
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[Signature]
MEMO TO:  PLANNING DEPARTMENT
FROM:  LEONARD NIESZCZYK, FIRE INSPECTOR
SUBJECT:  93/EA-10; 93/SV-06; 93/SMI-56
TMC:  4-4-09:05
PROJECT NAME:  SHERATON MAUI REDEVELOPMENT
APPLICANT:  KYO-YA COMPANY, LTD.

Dear Mr. Niemczyk:

Thank you for your letter to the Maui County Planning Department, dated August 10, 1993, responding to the request for comments on the above referenced Draft EA. We note that your office has no objections to the applicant's request. The project will comply with all applicable fire code requirements.

We appreciate your review of the EA.

Sincerely,

HELDER HASTERT & PEE, Planners

Leslie Kusuki
Project Planner

c/o Brian Mitan, Maui County Planning Director
Wayne Judd, ITT Sheraton
Shoji Tani, Kyoy Company, Ltd.
Kevin Chan, WATC
Mr. Brian Miskea
Page 2
August 19, 1993

The applicant should be responsible for the cost of the reassessment and the further improvements needed at the intersection. In the reassessment, the applicant's consultant should assume a worst-case situation where most of the users of the new resorting facilities are coming from outside of the Kaanapali Beach Resort area.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Peter D. Johnson
Director of Transportation

Mr. Brian Miskea
Director
Planning Department
County of Maui
250 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Mr. Miskea:

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
SMAP/Shoreline Setback Variance Applications
TMR: 4-4-83: 05

Thank you for your transmittal of August 2, 1993, requesting our comments on the proposed project.

We feel that the traffic congestion at the intersection of Kaanapali Parkway and Honolua Bay Highway is now the worst traffic problem in West Maui. We intend to correct this current problem by constructing improvements at that intersection. We plan to advertise this project for bids within three months and complete the construction in the second quarter of 1994.

Because of funding and other problems, we will not complete the Lahaina Bypass project by the time the renovation of Sheraton Maui is completed. Any problem caused by the new traffic generated by the renovated Sheraton Maui will show up at the intersection of Kaanapali Parkway and Honolua Bay Highway.

We recommend that you require the applicant to reassess the traffic situation at Kaanapali Parkway/Honolua Bay Highway intersection a few months after the reopening of the hotel to see if any further improvements can be made to the intersection.
September 28, 1993

Mr. Rex D. Johnson
Director of Transportation
State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
859 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813-5097

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
        Environmental Assessment
        TMK 4-4-08-05
        Your Letter to Maui County Planning Dept., August 19, 1993

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Thank you for your August 19, 1993 letter to the Maui County Planning Department, providing comments on the above-referenced project. Your comments have been forwarded to the project owner/applicant, architect and traffic consultant.

The applicant and their traffic engineers, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc., will continue to work closely with both your Department and the County of Maui to mitigate the traffic situation at the intersection of Kaanapali Parkway and Hospital Highway.

Thank you again for your input and cooperation.

Sincerely,

HELBER HASTERT & FEH, Planners

Leslie Kuritski
Project Planner

cc: Brian Miikae, Maui County Planning Director
    Wayne Iden, HST Shainio
    Shunji Yamai, Kyo-yi Company, Ltd.
    Kevin Chan, WATG
    Rob Miyazaki, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.
Hon. B. Nikesa

Division of Aquatic Resources

The Division of Aquatic Resources notes that their previous comments contained in our letter of April 15, 1993 (attached in Appendix F of the DPA), remain applicable.

We reiterate the comments of our Historic Preservation Division which were forwarded to you directly in their letter dated September 2, 1993.

We have no other comments to offer at this time. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.

Please feel free to contact Steve Yamas at our Office of Conservation and Environmental Affairs, at 507-0377, should you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Keith W. Nake

The Honorable Brian W. Nakes, Director
Planning Department
County of Maui
250 South High Street
Maui, Hawaii 96793

Dear Mr. Nakeses:

Subject: Special Management Area Permit/Shoreline Setback Variance
Applications (93/07-10, 93/09-06, 93/08-26): Sheraton Maui Redevelopment, Kaanapali, Maui, TMK 4-4-08-
5

We have received the following comments:

Division of Land Management

The Division of Land Management comments that they are not in concurrence to the construction of peeron improvements within the shoreline setback area unless they are permitted with the ordnances regulations.

Office of Conservation and Environmental Affairs

The Office of Conservation and Environmental Affairs comments that the old pier at the northern end of the property is located within the Conservation District. As such, the renovation/development of this pier will require that a Conservation District Use Application (CDA) is filed with our Department and approved by the Board of Land and Natural Resources.

Any other activities in areas within of the certified shoreline will require consultation with our office for possible CDA requirements.
September 28, 1993

Mr. Keith W. Aune
State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
P.O. Box 621
Honolulu, HI 96808

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
Draft Environmental Assessment
File No. 94-043-003

Your Letter to Maui County Planning Dept., September 13, 1993

Dear Mr. Aune:

Thank you for your letter of September 13, 1993 to the Maui County Planning Department, providing comments on the above-referenced project. We have reviewed your comments and offer the following responses:

Division of Land Management

This division commented that "they are not in concurrence with the construction of permanent improvements to the Shoreline Setback Area unless they are permitted with the ordinance regulations."

The project will comply with the Shoreline Setback Rules and Regulations of the County of Maui. Some construction is proposed within the 150-foot shoreline setback at the Black Rock area of the property, and the developer has applied for a shoreline setback variance (SBV) with the County of Maui. The environmental assessment was submitted in conjunction with the application. The SBV request is limited to the Black Rock area, which has unique physical and geological characteristics making it vulnerable to coastal storms and beach erosion than other beachfront areas. For example, the Black Rock is a rocky outcrop, and proposed structures will be situated from 30 to 70 feet above mean sea level.

Finally, as a follow-up to a phone conversation with representatives from your Maui District Office, we'd like to emphasize that there are no proposed improvements or structures on the certified shoreline.

Office of Conservation and Environmental Affairs

This office comments that the old pier is located within the Conservation District and that a Conservation District Use Application (CDUA) will be required for renovation of the pier. We acknowledge that renovation of the old pier will require a CDUA. Other than the pier renovation, there will be no other development activities other than the certified shoreline which would require a CDUA.

Heller Hastert & Fee

P.O. Box 621
Honolulu, HI 96808

Telephone: (808) 586-0665
Fax: (808) 586-0663

Division of Aquatic Resources

Your letter reference the comments made in an earlier April 15 letter by the Division of Aquatic Resources. In that April 15 letter, mitigation measures were recommended to minimize erosion and siltation. These included scheduling site work for periods of minimal rainfall, replanting or covering lands denuded of vegetation, and preventing construction materials and debris from entering the aquatic environment. Your comments have been forwarded to the owner/applicant, architect, civil engineer and construction contractor. These and other erosion control measures will be followed during site work and project construction.

We will be responding directly to the State Historic Preservation Division, commenting on your comments. As recommended, a qualified archaeologist will be on site to monitor the project construction. The applicant and their archaeological consultant will continue to work closely with the State Historic Preservation Division and will comply with all conditions pertaining to that project.

Thank you again for your input and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Heller Hastert & Fee, Planners

Leslie Kurihara
Project Planner

cc: Brian Mikhas, Maui County Planning Director
Wayne Hudd, ITT Sheraton
Shirly Yama, Keyser Company, Ltd.
Kevin Chu, WATCO
Adrian Weng, Austin Yatsuichi & Associates
September 2, 1993

Mr. Brian Hiakoa, Director
Maui Planning Department
250 South High Street
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii 96793

Dear Mr. Hiakoa:

SUBJECT: County of Maui Historic Preservation Review of the Proposed Lahaina Maui Redevelopment (92/EA-40, 93/DR-1, 93/EA-9)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Special Management Area Use Permit and shoreline setback variance applications for the proposed renovation of the existing hotel facilities.

This proposed project has undergone historic preservation review as reflected in the Draft Environmental Assessment's Chapter IV and Appendix C. Historic preservation concerns have been adequately addressed in Chapter IV-4 through IV-6. An archaeological inventory survey was conducted and the findings were summarized and incorporated in the Draft EA. Although the monitoring was conducted, we have recommended that archaeological monitoring be conducted during excavations. This recommendation has also been included. Appendix C contains a copy of the accepted final report and a copy of our review of the report. The requested trench profile drawings have been submitted to our office.

Should these applications be approved, we recommend that the following condition be attached to the approved permit:

A qualified archaeologist shall monitor all activities involving below grade disturbance. If historic remains are encountered, the monitoring archaeologist shall be allowed sufficient time to recover significant data. For inadvertent discovery of human burials, the developer shall comply with Chapter 50-13.6 (H.R.S.). An acceptable

S. Hiakoa
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monitoring report shall be submitted to the State Historic Preservation Division at the completion of the project.

Please contact Mr. Anna Griffin at 887-0013 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Don Nishino, Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division

Mahana
September 28, 1993

Mr. Don Hibbard, Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division
State of Hawai‘i
Department of Land and Natural Resources
33 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Subject: Shōren-in Maui Redevelopment
Draft Environmental Assessment
TMR 4-4-88-85
Your Letter to Maui County Planning Dept., September 2, 1993

Dear Mr. Hibbard:

Thank you for your letter of September 2, 1993 to the Maui County Planning Department, providing comments on the above-referenced project. Your letter has been forwarded to the project owner/applicant, project architect and archaeological consultant.

As you have recommended, a qualified archaeologist will be present on site to monitor major subsurface excavation activity. Should human remains be encountered at any time during project construction, archaeological consultation will be sought immediately.

The applicant and their archaeologists, Paul H. Rosenshine, Ph.D. Inc., will continue to work closely with your Department and will comply with all permit conditions pertaining to historic preservation and archaeological resources.

Thank you again for your input and cooperation.

Sincerely,

HELBER HARDY & PEB, Planners

Leslie Kurzinski
Project Planner

cc: Brian Mitchell, Maui County Planning Director
Wayne Jud, ITT Sheraton
Shuji Yasui, Ryosya Company, Ltd.
Kevin Chua, WATG
Alan Walter, FHWA

Helber Hardy & PEB
2333 Kapi‘olani Boulevard, Suite 2250
Honolulu, HI 96815
Phone: 808-948-3855
Fax: 808-948-3860
To: Mr. Brian Mihake, Director  

To: Clayton Yoshida  

Subject: T. D. No. 52/E-10, 52/ES/26, 93/SM/26  

Draft Environmental Assessment

Sharon Mauh Redevelopment
Applicant: Kyo-ya Company, Ltd.

The subject proposal has been reviewed and confirmed that no Government Survey Tractellation Stations and Benchmarks are affected. Survey has no objections to the proposed project.

Leif E. Kusinski  
Active State Land Surveyor

September 28, 1993

Mr. Stanley T. Haagava  
Acting State Land Surveyor  
State of Hawaii  
Department of Accounting and General Services  
Survey Division  
P.O. Box 119  
Honoalohi, IL 56510

Subject: Sharon Mauh Redevelopment  

Draft Environmental Assessment  
TMR 4-4-66-29  

Your letter to Maui County Planning Dept., August 5, 1993

Dear Mr. Haagava:

Thank you for your letter to the Maui County Planning Department, dated August 5, 1993, requesting to the request for comments on the above referenced Draft EA. We note that your office has no objections to the proposed project.

We appreciate your review of the EA.

Sincerely,

HILBER HAERTZ & FISCH, Planners

Leslie Kusinski  
Project Planner

c: Brian Mihake, Maui County Planning Director  
Wayne Judd, TTT Sharon  
Shoji Tanai, Kyo-ya Company, Ltd.  
Kevin Chin, WATG
Mr. Brian Mocke
Planning Director
Sheraton Maui Department
250 South High Street
Wailuku, Maui 96793

Dear Mr. Mocke:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
Draft Environmental Assessment (TMK 4-4-01:05).

As indicated in the report, the Sheraton Maui renovation will create 800
construction-related jobs, as well as other indirect employment. This
will provide construction workers with some much-needed employment
opportunities. However, the Department is concerned about the 300 hotel
workers who will be temporarily displaced for a year while the hotel is
being rebuilt. Every effort should be made to refer these workers to
this Department so that appropriate services can be provided them.

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to comment on the project. If
you need more information or have any questions, please call Frederick Pang,
Chief, Research and Statistics Office, at 856-8999.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rayton H. Nakasone
Director

September 28, 1993

Mr. Dayron M. Nakasone, Director
State of Hawaii
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
330 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
        Environmental Assessment

Dear Mr. Nakasone:

Thank you for your letter of August 31, 1993 to the Maui County Planning
Department, commenting on the above-referenced project. You note that the
Department is concerned about the 300 hotel workers who will be temporarily
displaced during the hotel redevelopment.

Recently, the Sheraton Maui Hotel formally announced its plans for the redevelopment
project and the 15-month closure of the hotel during the renovation. The hotel closure
is anticipated to commence in the fourth quarter of 1994. Based on the requirements of
the federal Dislocated Workers Act (EDWAA), a minimum 60-day official notice will
be provided to employees prior to closure of the hotel. Letters regarding the hotel
closure will also be sent to your Department, to the Maui County Mayor, and Tony
Rodriguez, head of Local 5. In the case of non-union employees, letters will be sent
individually.

As the closure is viewed as a temporary layoff with full rights to rehire, the hotel
intends to guarantee a minimum 90 days of health care coverage to employees eligible
prior to the layoff, as was done at the Sheraton Kauai. This will include both union
members and non-union staff.

It may be possible to retain certain employees to maintain grounds and security. Others
are eligible for unemployment compensation benefits and some employees may be
eligible for early retirement. Training and retraining programs will also be offered with
the assistance of the State's "rapid response team" under EDWAA. Sheraton
Maui employees will assisted in placement at other Sheraton Hawaii hotels.
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, HONOLULU
E. HASTERT, P.E.
August 13, 1993

DEPT OF PLANNING
COUNTY OF MAUI
RECEIVED

Planning Division

Mr. Clayton Yoshida
Mau Planning Department
County of Maui
258 South High Street
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii 96793

Dear Mr. Yoshida:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Special Management Area Permit Application for the Sheraton Maui Redevelopment Plan (WKR 4-4-6: 65). The following comments are provided pursuant to Corps of Engineers authorities to disseminate flood hazard information under the Flood Control Act of 1968 and to issue Department of the Army (DA) permits under the Clean Water Acts: the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act.

a. File Number R03-042 has been assigned to your project. As stated in a previous letter from our Operations Division dated April 7, 1993, any work in waters of the U.S. will require a DA permit as well as modifications to the existing pier. Please contact our Operations Division at 439-9250 for further information.

b. The flood hazard information provided on page IV-3 is correct.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas Ushijima, P.E.
Acting Director of Engineering

Heller Haster
Planners

September 28, 1993

Mr. Thomas Ushijima, P.E.
Acting Director of Engineering
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu
Bldg. 220
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96850-5440

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
Draft Environmental Assessment
TMK 4-4-6:65
Your Letter to Maui County Planning Dept., August 13, 1993

Dear Mr. Ushijima:

Thank you for your letter to the Maui County Planning Department, dated August 13, 1993, responding to the request for comments on the above referenced Draft EA.

As noted in the Draft EA, redevelopment of the pier is not a part of the subject project or proposal action. However, should the applicant be involved in any future renovation of the pier, your office will be contacted regarding possible DA permit requirements.

We appreciate your review of the EA.

Sincerely,

HEILBER HASTER & FEB, Planners

Leslie Krasniki
Project Planner

cc: Brian Miyake, Maui County Planning Director
Wayne Judd, IIT Sheraton
Shirley Yasui, Kyo-ya Company, Ltd.
Kevin Chiu, WATC
August 13, 1993

Mr. Brian Mikao, Planning Director
County of Maui
Maui Planning Department
350 S. High Street
Wailuku, HI 96793

Dear Mr. Mikao:

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
TMK 4-4-26-05

Thank you for allowing us to comment on the subject project.

In reviewing the information transmitted and our records, we have no objection to the subject project. We have already been in contact with Helbert Hastert and Fee, Planners about our concerns on the impact of this project to our distribution system. Therefore, we encourage the developer's electrical consultant to meet with us as soon as practical to verify the project's electrical requirements so that service can be provided on a timely basis.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call Dan Takahata at 871-2385.

Sincerely,

Edward L. Reinhardt
Manager, Engineering

cc: Leslie Kurianki, Helbert Hastert and Fee, Planners

Helbert Hastert & Fee

September 28, 1993

Mr. Edward L. Reinhardt
Manager, Engineering
Maui Electric Company, Ltd.
210 West Kamehameha Ave.
P.O. Box 976
Kahului, Maui, HI 96733

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
TMK 4-4-26-05

Dear Mr. Reinhardt:

Thank you for your letter to the Maui County Planning Department, dated August 13, 1993. Your comments have been forwarded to the project developer, architect and electrical engineer. Mr. Al Kilberg of Douglas V. MacMahan, Ltd., the project's electrical consultant, will contact you to discuss the project's electrical requirements, as you have recommended.

Thank you again for your input and cooperation.

Sincerely,

HELBER HASTERT & FEE, Planners

Leslie Kurianki
Project Planner

cc: Brian Mikao, Maui County Planning Director
Wayne Jobb, IIT Sheraton
Shoji Yamai, Kio-ya Company, Ltd.
Kevin Chen, WATG
Al Kilberg, Douglas MacMahan Ltd.
University of Hawaii at Manoa
Environmental Center
A Unit of Water Resources Research Center
Crawford 317 - 2220 Correa Road - Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Telephone: (808) 956-7331

County of Maui Planning Department
Attention: Clayton Yoshida
250 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Mr. Yoshida:

Draft Environmental Assessment (EA)
Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
 Lahaina, Maui

Koa-ya Company, Ltd proposes to renovate the Sheraton Maui Hotel. The project will include renovation of the original Cliff Tower and Garden Tower, demolition of the Molokai wing, the addition of several new structures including a new “Garden Wing,” Nakalele Village (4, five story structures), conference facilities, parking structures, swining pool and associated recreational facilities. The plan also includes a concept design for renovation of an old pier located on the northern end of the site.

The Environmental Center has reviewed the proposed project with the assistance of Blue Griffin, Anthropology and Carolyn McCool, Environmental Center.

GENERAL COMMENTS

In general, we find that this environmental assessment is deficient in that it does not fulfill the intent of Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes pursuant to HRS 343-5 (d), nor does it follow the guidelines for multiple or phased application or agency written under 11-200-7 (HAR). As a consequence, the potential significance of the project as defined under Section 11-200-12 (HAR), cannot be determined from the information provided. More specifically, we note that “the plan includes a long term development concept for restoration of the old pier...” however, the EA does not address potential impacts associated with the construction, renovation or operation of this pier. Instead, the EA states that at such time as the renovation of the pier is in progress, that a supplemental EA may be required.

County of Maui Planning Department
September 22, 1993
Page 2

If the pier is to be a part of this development, then its renovation and any potential impacts generated by its operation should be addressed in this document, in accordance with HRS 343, (HAR) 11-200-7 and (HAR) 11-200-12. Furthermore, given the potential significance of the impacts of structures in the coastal area and on coastal near shore processes, it is likely that the impacts of the construction/renovation of the pier may have a significant effect on the environment, hence requiring the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

ARCHAEOLOGY

We note in Appendix C, Archeological Subsurface Inventory Survey, that no sub-surface archaeological remains were unearthed during that survey. However, we also note that the Appendix cites the evidence of extensive “protohistoric period” Hawaiian populations along the coastal area. It is our understanding that burials were encountered when this hotel was originally constructed. Hence our reviewers are concerned that burials may present in the existing cottage area. Considering the evidence for large scale occupation of this coastal area and the prior archaeological discoveries, we urge that an archaeological monitor be on site during any excavations.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this document and look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

Joan R. Miller
Associate Environmental Coordinator

cc: OESC
Koa-ya Company, Ltd.
Halle`a Huestert and Flora, Planners
Roger Fujikaki
Blue Griffin
Carolyn McCool
September 29, 1993

Ms. Jacquelyn N. Miller
Associate Environmental Coordinator
Environmental Center
University of Hawaii at Manoa
Crawford 317, 2550 Campus Road
Honolulu, HI 96822

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
Draft Environmental Assessment
TMK 4-4-18:05

Dear Ms. Miller:

Thank you for your letter of September 21, 1993 to the Maui County Planning Department, providing comments on the above-referenced project. We strongly disagree with your statement that the document is "deficient." We believe that the EA adequately describes the potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation and fulfills the requirements of Chapter 343 HRS.

We offer the following responses to your comments:

General Comments

Your letter states that "in general, we find this environmental assessment deficient in that it does not fulfill the intent of Chapter 343...nor the guidelines for multiple or phased applicant or agency actions under 14-208-7 (HARS)." In support of this statement, you note that the EA does not address potential impacts associated with the construction, renovation or operation of the old pier.

Redevelopment of the old pier is not a part of the proposed action, but is part of a long-term plan which will require the cooperation of the adjacent landowner and the community, and will be subject to further environmental review at that time. The concept plan presented in the EA was intended to be illustrative only. Because no detailed plans or designs for the pier renovation have been completed, it would be inappropriate to conduct an environmental assessment at the present time. If and when the project is initiated in the future, an EA, in accordance with Chapter 343, HRS, is likely to be triggered by:

- Use of State or County lands or funds, if the State or County is participating in the project; and/or
- Use of State Conservation District lands, as the pier is located within the State Conservation District, and will require a Conservation District Use Application.

At that time, more detailed plans for the pier redevelopment will be available, and the project's environmental impacts can be more accurately assessed.

Archaeology

The DLNR-SHPD has reviewed the archaeological survey report prepared by Paul H. Honodel, Inc., and has provided written comments to the Maui County Planning Department. In their comment letter, dated September 2, 1993, the DLNR-SHPD recommends that a qualified archaeologist monitor all activities involving below grade disturbances. If historic remains are encountered, DLNR-SHPD recommends that the monitoring archaeologist be allowed sufficient time to recover significant data. In the event human burials are discovered, it is noted that the developer shall comply with Chapter 654-6, HRS. Finally, an acceptable monitoring report to DLNR-SHPD is requested, upon completion of construction.

The applicant will provide a qualified archaeologist on site to monitor major subsurface excavation as recommended by DLNR-SHPD, and will comply with all other conditions required by the County. Should any human remains be encountered during project construction, archaeological consultation will be sought immediately. The project archaeologists will continue to work closely with the DLNR-SHPD staff throughout the construction period.

Summary

Overall, we believe that the EA fulfills the intent of Chaddesley's address and discusses the project's potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. The EA was prepared in consultation with appropriate County, State and federal agencies, whose comments and comments have been incorporated into the document. Based on the agency input and the findings of our technical consultants, we believe that the proposed actions will not have a significant environmental or ecological effect.

Thank you again for your input.

Sincerely,

HELMER HASTERT & FEB, Planners

Leslie Kurisaki
Project Planner

cc: Brian Miki, Maui County Planning Director
Wayne Judd, H.T. Sherwood
Shiiji Yanai, Kyo-ya Company, Ltd.
Kevin Chun, WATG
TO:   Mr. Brian Mocks  
    Director of Planning

FROM:  Ms. Stephanie Awairo  
    Director of Housing and Human Concerns

SUBJECT: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment Applications for Special Management Area Permit & Shoreline Setback Variance  
         L.O. No. 92/EA-010, 92/HM1 026, 92/SHA-006 
         T/R: 4-4-38125

We have reviewed the following documents:
1. Mr. Clayton Yoshida's September 17, 1993 transmittal letter
2. Nyo-ya Company, Ltd.'s Applications for Special Management Area Permit and Shoreline Setback Variance
3. Draft Environmental Assessment Report for the subject project

and would like to offer the following comments:

1. The applicant states in the Special Management Area Permit Application and draft Environmental Assessment Report that the proposed redevelopment of the Sheraton Maui Hotel will not increase the total number of hotel rooms. That being the case, the proposed project falls under the provisions of Section 14.64.002(A) of the Maui County Code, and is excluded from the County's affordable housing policy for the hotel-related developments.

2. The applicant states in the draft Environmental Assessment Report that the Maui County Planning Commission has established policy guidelines relating to employee housing requirements for hotel developments.

Mr. Brian Mocks  
September 29, 1993

The applicant should be advised that the Maui County Planning Commission's Resolution No. 2 (1992), Relating To An Employee Housing Policy For Hotel-Related Developments, is superseded by Maui County ordinance No. 2093 which established an Affordable Housing Policy for Hotel-Related Developments (effective March 20, 1992).

3. The applicant has satisfactorily addressed all of the questions in my April 1, 1993 letter to Ms. Leilani Maniaki. Therefore, we do not have any additional comments to offer.

Please call Mr. Nohsio or Mr. Edwin Ohira of our Housing Division at ext. 7735 if you have any question.
September 29, 1993

Ms. Stephanie Avello, Director
Department of Housing and Human Concerns
County of Maui
200 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
Draft Environmental Assessment
TMX 4-4 080
Your Memo to Maui County Planning Dept., September 29, 1993

Dear Ms. Avello:

Thank you for your memo to the Maui County Planning Department, dated September 29, 1993, responding to the request for comments on the above-referenced Draft EA.

We note that since the redevelopment of the Sheraton Maui Hotel will not increase the total number of hotel rooms, the project is excluded from the County’s affordable housing policy for hotel-related developments. We have also noted that the Planning Commission’s 1987 policy guidelines concerning employee housing have been superseded by Maui County Ordinance No. 90-3, Affordable Housing Policy for Hotel-Related Developments, effective March 29, 1992.

We appreciate your review of the EA.

Sincerely,

HELBER HASTERT & PEE, Planners

Leslie Kurinski
Senior Planner

cc: Brian Mikes, Maui County Planning Director
Wayne Judd, IHT Sheraton
Shigii Yamauchi, Kono Company, Ltd.
Kevin Chan, WATG
September 30, 1993

Mr. David R. Craddick, Director
Department of Water Supply
County of Maui
P.O. Box 1109
Wailuku, HI 96783-1109

Subject: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment
Draft Environmental Assessment
TMX 4-48-05
Your Letter to Maui County Planning Dept., September 23, 1993

Dear Mr. Craddick:

Thank you for your letter to the Maui County Planning Department, dated September 23, 1993, responding to the request for comments on the above referenced Draft EA.

Your letter has been forwarded to the owners and their engineering consultants. We note that your department has no objections to the on and near-site improvements, based on an estimated 2,000 gallons per day increase in water use. Domestic and fireflow water use calculations will be submitted to your department as required.

Finally, as you have recommended, the project will incorporate water efficient design and landscaping.

We appreciate your review of the EA.

Sincerely,

HOLLER HASTERT & FELD, Planners

Leslie Kuriski
Project Planner

cc: Brian Mikas, Maui County Planning Director
Wayne Jude, ITT Sheraton
Shoji Yam, Kao-ya Company, Ltd.
Kevin Chan, WATC
Adrianne Wong, AIA

DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY
COUNTY OF MAUI
P.O. BOX 1109
WAILUKU, MAUI 96793-1109

September 23, 1993

Mr. Brian W. Mikas, Director
County of Maui Planning Department
Wailuku, Maui 96793

Dear Mr. Mikas,

Re: Sheraton Maui Redevelopment, TMX 4-48-05, Kahana; Request for Environmental Assessment, Shoreline setback Variance and Special Management Area Use Permit Approvals, 93/EA-19, 93/EA-20, 93/EA-21.

We have no objections to the on- and near-site improvements for the project based on the applicant's estimate of an increase of 2000 gallons-per-day (gpd) in water use for the renovated project at full occupancy.

However, this is not an endorsement for the proposed Adams water development plans and new wells also presented in the report.

The applicant will be required to submit domestic and fireflow water use calculations to demonstrate adequate water for the project.

We note that the applicant plans for a non-domestic consumption of 114,200 gpd. The applicant should be advised to incorporate water-efficient soil preparation, irrigation and water-feature designs to minimize water use, such as shading the wets from the sun, screening the wets from the wind and using non-skinning grass. Guidance in water-efficient landscaping may be found in the attached document or in the Maui County Planning Plan. We are presented in these and other references to create a lush experience in a technically water-efficient landscape.

Sincerely,

David R. Craddick, Director

DEP.
** Pipe Legend **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe Size</th>
<th>Schedule 40 (Schedule 80 PVC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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---
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---
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---
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---

** PRESSURE REDUCING VALVE INSTALLATION DETAIL **
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** SHERATON MAUI REDEVELOPMENT **
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