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Executive Summary

Project Name: Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction

Type of Document: Final Environmental Assessment

Legal Authority: Chapter 343, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes

Agency Determination: Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Applicable Environmental Assessment Review “Trigger”: Use of lands within the Lahaina National Historic Landmark District

Location: TMK (2) 4-5-001:019
Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Applicant: McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 2000
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813
Contact: Mike Yamamoto
Telephone: (808) 585-7173

Accepting Agency: Maui Planning Commission
250 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

Consultant: Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793
Contact: Michael T. Munekiyo, A. I. C. P.
Telephone: (808) 244-2015

Project Summary: McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc. proposes the demolition and reconstruction of the Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant to provide required facility upgrades which will meet current corporate design standards. A new 4,365-square foot restaurant will replace the existing 4,274-square foot establishment. Encompassing an area of approximately 0.51 acre, the project site is located on the corner of Papalaua Street and Waine‘e Street in Lahaina, Maui.
The subject property is located within the Lahaina National Historic Landmark District. Work performed within the Lahaina National Historic Landmark District is a trigger for the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA), pursuant to Chapter 343, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS). Accordingly, this EA has been prepared to document and review the project’s technical characteristics, environmental impacts, and alternatives. Furthermore, the project site is located in the County of Maui’s Special Management Area (SMA), requiring the preparation of a SMA Use Permit application. It is noted that the Maui Planning Commission will serve as the approving agency for the EA and SMA Use Permit application.
I. PROJECT OVERVIEW
I. PROJECT OVERVIEW

A. PROJECT LOCATION, EXISTING USE, AND OWNERSHIP

The applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., proposes the demolition and reconstruction of the Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant to provide required facility upgrades which will meet current corporate design standards. The site is identified by Tax Map Key (TMK) (2) 4-5-001:019. See Figure 1 and Figure 2. Encompassing an area of approximately 0.51 acre, the project site is located on the corner of Papalaua Street and Waine’e Street in Lahaina, Maui. Access to the property is via Papalaua Street, a two-lane, improved County roadway which runs in an east-west direction.

Surrounding land uses include the shops and restaurants associated with the Lahaina Shopping Center, Lahaina Square, Lahaina Center, Anchor Square, and the West Maui Center. The subject property is classified “Urban” by the State Land Use Commission; zoned “B-2, Community Business District” by the County of Maui zoning ordinance; and designated “Business/Commercial” by the West Maui Community Plan. Furthermore, the subject property is located within the Lahaina National Historic Landmark District, and in the County of Maui’s Special Management Area (SMA).

The subject property is owned by McDonald’s Corporation.

B. PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action involves the demolition of the existing 4,274-square foot Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant, and the subsequent reconstruction of an approximately 4,365-square foot McDonald’s Restaurant. Similar to the existing restaurant, the reconstructed restaurant will be a one-story structure measuring approximately 24 feet in height. Also involved in the proposed action are landscaping, parking, and related utilities improvements. See Figure 3, Figure 4, Figure 5, and Figure 6.

The restaurant opened for business in June 1983 and is now over 25 years old. The proposed project is intended to yield an updated and redesigned restaurant, incorporating facility upgrades required to meet current corporate design standards. Moreover, the exterior design
Figure 1  Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction Regional Location Map

Prepared for: McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.

Source: U.S. Geological Survey, Lahaina Quad Map
Figure 2

Proposed Lahaina McDonald's
Restaurant Reconstruction
Property Location Map

Prepared for: McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
Figure 3

Proposed Lahaina McDonald's
Restaurant Reconstruction
Existing Site Plan

Source: Patrick M. Cummins, Licensed Professional Surveyor

Prepared for: McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
Figure 5 Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction Elevations
Figure 6
Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction
Floor Plan

Source: McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
Prepared for: McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
has been specially tailored by a local architect to complement and honor the historic architectural character of Lahaina Town.

The new restaurant will be serviced by a reconfigured parking lot and drive-thru lane which have been designed to minimize traffic congestion by accommodating more cars on site and processing orders at a faster rate. Meanwhile, the new restaurant’s interior has been professionally designed to create a unique dining experience. The reconstructed restaurant will be one of the first McDonald’s Restaurants worldwide to embody the new McDonald’s theme of “Forever Young”. The new design has been formulated to provide a delightful, contemporary experience for the restaurant’s many customers.

C. CHAPTER 343, HAWAI‘I REVISED STATUTES REQUIREMENT

The subject property is located within the Lahaina National Historic Landmark District. Work performed within the Lahaina National Historic Landmark District is a trigger for the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA), pursuant to Chapter 343, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS). Accordingly, this EA has been prepared in order to document and review the project’s technical characteristics, environmental impacts, and alternatives.

D. IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

The project site is located in the County of Maui’s SMA, requiring the preparation of an SMA Use Permit application. The SMA Use Permit application will be filed with the Maui County Planning Department for processing and action by the Maui Planning Commission.

The construction cost for the proposed project is approximately $1.2 million. Pending the receipt of all necessary permits, construction is anticipated to last approximately five (5) to six (6) months.
II. DESCRIPTION OF THE EXISTING ENVIRONMENT, POTENTIAL IMPACTS, AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES
II. DESCRIPTION OF THE EXISTING ENVIRONMENT, POTENTIAL IMPACTS, AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

A. PHYSICAL SETTING

1. Surrounding Land Uses

a. Existing Conditions

The project site is situated in the midst of Lahaina’s business/commercial district. A multitude of retail and office commercial complexes surround the subject property. Land uses to the immediate north of the property, across Papalaua Street, include Kaiser Permanente’s Lahaina Clinic, First Hawaiian Bank’s Lahaina Branch, and the restaurants and shops of the Lahaina Center. The State of Hawai‘i’s Pi‘ilani Elderly Housing Project complex and Hale Mahaolu’s Lahaina Surf apartment complex are located further north of the Lahaina Center. The Longhi Building and the shops and restaurants of Lahaina’s Front Street are located to the southwest of the project site; Lahaina Square Shopping Center is to the south. To the east and northeast of the subject property are Honoapi‘ilani Highway, the West Maui Center, and the Lahaina Ka‘anapali & Pacific Railroad Station, as well as numerous commercial outlets fronting the highway north of Pioneer Mill Company Ltd.’s former sugar mill.

b. Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures

The proposed action involves the reconstruction of an existing food service establishment to improve service and effect a more efficient use of the subject property. The establishment is complementary to the surrounding land uses, and as such, the project is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on surrounding retail and commercial uses.
2. **Climate**

a. **Existing Conditions**

Like most areas of Hawai‘i, Lahaina's climate is relatively uniform year-round. Lahaina's tropical latitude, its position relative to storm tracts and the Pacific anticyclone, and the surrounding ocean combine to produce this stable climate. Variations in climate among different regions on Maui are, therefore, dictated by the inherent characteristics of local terrain.

Average daily temperatures in Lahaina typically range between 66 degrees and 88 degrees Fahrenheit. September is historically the warmest month, while February is the coolest (County of Maui, OED 2008).

Rainfall in West Maui is highly seasonal in nature, with most precipitation occurring between the months of November and April when winter storms hit the area. Situated on the leeward side of the West Maui Mountains, this relatively dry region receives most of its rainfall in late afternoon and early evening, after seabreezes take moisture upslope during the day. Average annual rainfall amounts to just under 15 inches. Precipitation data collected at the Kapalua-West Maui Airport station show that on average, January is the wettest month with 3.15 inches of rain, while June is the driest, with just 0.08 inch (County of Maui, OED 2008).

The winds in the Lahaina area are also seasonal, although northeasterly tradewinds are predominant, occurring 90 percent of the time during winter and 50 percent of the time during summer. Wind patterns also vary on a daily basis, with tradewinds generally being stronger in the afternoon. During the day, winds blow onshore toward the warmer land mass. This process reverses in the evening when breezes blow toward the relatively warm ocean.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The proposed action will not have an adverse effect on the local climate. The proposed project will have a low profile and is not anticipated to alter wind patterns in the area.
3. **Topography and Soil Characteristics**

   a. **Existing Conditions**

   The existing ground elevations range from a low of 14.9 feet above mean sea level (amsl) at the western corner of the property on Papalaua Street, to 16.0 feet amsl at the eastern corner on Waine’e Street, to a high of 16.3 feet amsl at the intersection of Papalaua and Waine’e Streets. For reference, the existing restaurant floor elevation is 17.0 feet amsl. See Appendix “A”. With the exception of landscaped areas along the perimeter, the project site is currently completely paved.

   Soils at the project site belong to the Pulehu-Ewa-Jaucas association. See Figure 7. The specific soil types at the project site are Pulehu Silt Loam (PpA) and Ewa Silty Clay Loam (EaA). See Figure 8. Soils of both the Pulehu and Ewa series are well-drained soils, found on alluvial fans and stream terraces and in basins. The Pulehu Silt Loam and Ewa Silty Clay Loam types are characterized by 0 to 3 percent slopes, moderate permeability, slow to medium runoff, and no more than slight erosion hazard. These soils are often used for sugar cane and pasture, with small acreages used for homesites. Vegetation normally associated with the Pulehu and Ewa series include Bermuda grass, bristly foxtail, finger grass, kiawe, klu, lantana, koa haole, and sandbur (USDA, 1972).

   b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

   The proposed action involves the demolition and reconstruction of the existing building, with expansions of landscaped areas, resurfacing of the paved parking lot, and improvements to the drive-thru lane. Topographic conditions of the project site will not be altered, as no grading or grubbing work will be required. Soil characteristics at the project site do not pose construction constraints for the proposed project. In sum, no adverse impacts to the topography or soil characteristics of the project site are anticipated.
Figure 7

Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction
Soil Association Map

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service
Figure 8  Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction Soil Classification Map

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service

NOT TO SCALE
4. Agricultural Productivity Considerations

a. Existing Conditions

The lands underlying the subject property are located within the State “Urban” district, and as such they have supported business, commercial, and public/quasi-public activities for decades.

The coastal flatlands and plateaus of the West Maui Mountains are suitable for agricultural crop cultivation. Soils are dark reddish-brown, stony, well-drained, and deep in the areas north of Lahaina, but stony in the areas south of Lahaina. Slopes along the coastal flatlands are level, whereas slopes on the plateaus range from gentle to steeply sloping. These plateaus are typically separated by deep, steep-sided canyons.

With regard to agricultural productivity attributes, the Land Study Bureau classifies lands with a productivity rating of “A” through “E”, with “A” reflecting lands with the highest productivity and “E” the lowest. The lands underlying the project site have an overall productivity rating of “A” and reflects land types which are well suited for agricultural uses. According to the Land Study Bureau's Detailed Land Classification Map, the project site has been rated A7li. The land type A7li represents deep, nonstony, well-drained, moderately fine-textured soils with slopes ranging from 0 to 10 percent and elevations ranging from sea level to 300 feet. See Figure 9.

Additionally, the State Department of Agriculture has established three (3) categories of Agricultural Lands of Importance to the State of Hawai‘i (ALISH). "Prime" lands are those lands which possess the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce high yields of crops economically and when treated and managed according to modern farming techniques. "Unique" lands have similar crop specific characteristics, while lands rated "Other" are not classified as "Prime" or "Unique", but are of Statewide or local agricultural importance. Lands not rated "Prime", "Unique" or "Other", are "Unclassified". According to the ALISH map, the lands underlying the restaurant reconstruction site are "Unclassified". See Figure 10.
Figure 9  Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction
Land Study Bureau Classification Map

Source: University of Hawai‘i, Land Study Bureau
U. S. G. S. Lahaina Quadrangle

Prepared for: McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
Figure 10  Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction
Agricultural Lands of Importance to the State of Hawai‘i

Prepared for: McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The proposed action is a continuation of the existing land use, involving land which is not utilized for agricultural purposes; therefore, the proposed project will not affect the inventory of lands available for agricultural cultivation, nor will the proposed project affect the inventory of land available for diversified agricultural use. In sum, the proposed project is not anticipated to have an adverse effect on agricultural productivity parameters for the island of Maui.

5. **Flood and Tsunami Hazards**

a. **Existing Conditions**

The Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) indicates that the project site is located in Zone X, areas determined to be outside the 0.2 percent annual chance flood plain. See Figure 11.

The project site is located outside of the tsunami inundation area.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The proposed action is not located within a flood hazard district and there are no flood-related restrictions on development in Flood Zone X. Moreover, the project site is located outside of the tsunami inundation area and tsunami evacuation zone. No adverse impacts to flood conditions are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

6. **Flora and Fauna**

a. **Existing Conditions**

The site has been previously developed and completely paved-over, with the exception of landscape buffers running along the perimeter of the subject property.

Fauna found in the surrounding area are typical of the urbanized regions of West Maui. Domestic mammals, such as dogs and cats, can be found in the project vicinity. Avifauna commonly found in the area include the common mynah, Japanese white-eye, spotted dove, barred dove, and house finch.
Figure 11  Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction
Flood Insurance Rate Map

Source: Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel No. 1500030361E

Prepared for: McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
There are no known endangered or rare species found in the project vicinity (Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc., 2005).

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The proposed project is not anticipated to have a negative impact on flora, fauna, or avifauna of the area. There are no rare, threatened, or endangered species of flora or fauna found at or in the vicinity of the subject property. The preliminary landscaping plan prescribes the use of native and indigenous species of trees and plants to the extent practicable. See Appendix “B”. In addition, the total landscaped area will be increased by approximately 842 square feet. In this capacity, the proposed project will make a positive contribution to botanical resources in the area.

7. **Streams, Wetlands, and Reservoirs**

a. **Existing Conditions**

The project site is located within an existing developed area, and according to the United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetland Inventory Map, there are no wetland features in close proximity to the project site. Furthermore, there are no streams or other inland water bodies in proximity to the project site.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

As there are no streams, wetlands, or reservoirs located in proximity to the project site, the proposed action is not anticipated to have any adverse effects on natural inland water features in the West Maui region.

8. **Air Quality**

a. **Existing Conditions**

There are no point sources of airborne emissions in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Although minimal, airborne pollutants are largely attributable to vehicular exhaust from traffic along Honoapi'ilani Highway and nearby roadways. Windblown dust from fallow fields is another source of indirect emissions in the region. These sources, however, are intermittent
and prevailing winds quickly disperse the particulates generated by these temporary sources. Overall, the air quality in the Lahaina region is considered good.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

In the short term, construction-related activities for the proposed restaurant reconstruction will be the primary source of airborne pollutants affecting the surrounding area. Appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be utilized to minimize air quality impacts associated with project construction. After the completion of construction, the proposed action is not anticipated to generate adverse long-term air quality impacts.

9. **Noise Characteristics**

a. **Existing Conditions**

There are no fixed noise generators in the vicinity of the project site. Existing background noise levels are primarily attributed to traffic from the nearby Honoapi‘ilani Highway and other surrounding roadways.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

Ambient noise conditions may be temporarily affected by construction activities. Heavy construction machinery and demolition operations are anticipated to be the dominant noise-generative sources during the construction period. Appropriate BMPs will be employed to mitigate noise impacts generated by construction machinery and operations. Notwithstanding, as applicable, a noise permit will be obtained for construction activities. Once completed, the proposed project itself is not anticipated to adversely alter noise conditions in the area.

10. **Archaeological Resources**

a. **Existing Conditions**

The project site has been historically and recently developed. With the exception of landscaping buffers around the perimeter, the site is now completely paved-over. It is noted that the project site is located within the
boundaries of the Lahaina National Historic Landmark District, an area listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Given the extensive surface disturbance in the past, the property is not considered significant in terms of historic or archaeological resource value. There are no known archaeological or culturally significant features in the project vicinity.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The proposed action involves the demolition and reconstruction of the existing structure, along with minor parking and landscaping improvements. A new spread footing will be required, however, the new footprint will not detract considerably from the existing. The parking lot is completely on-grade; therefore, no grading or grubbing will be required.

Based on the scope of work and past surface modifications to the property, no adverse impacts to archaeological resources are anticipated. Nonetheless, in the event inadvertent archaeological finds are encountered during construction, work will be halted in the immediate vicinity of the find, and appropriate mitigation protocols will be implemented in coordination with the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD).

11. **Cultural Resources**

a. **Existing Conditions**

The Lahaina District was considered to be a favorable place by high chiefs because of its natural resource qualities and proximity to Lana`i and Moloka`i. Initial development of agricultural field systems likely occurred early in the Expansion Period, between AD 1200 and 1400. While onshore and offshore fishponds yielded abundant seafood, fertile alluvial terraces and dry land cultivation produced coconut, breadfruit, banana, taro, sweet potato, sugarcane, and other nutritious crops. Trails running mauka to makai fortified both social and economic linkages between mountain and coastal villages. In addition, the *alamui* or “King’s trail” built by Kihapi’ilani stretched along the coast, connecting all major settlements between Lahaina and Makena (McGerty and Spear, 2008).
European explorers and traders began to frequent the Lahaina District in the late 1700s, spurring considerable transformations to the local landscape and economy. The islands of Maui, Moloka‘i, and Lana‘i encircle the ‘Au‘au Channel, providing for relatively calm waters and safe anchorage. The ancient Hawaiian name for Lahaina was Lele, which means “to leap” or “to disembark” as from a canoe. In pre-contact times, Lahaina’s harbor was referred to as Keawaiki, “the small harbor” (Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc., 2005).

During the reign of Kamehameha I, Lahaina thrived as a center for the lucrative and prospering sandalwood trade (McGerty and Spear, 2008). The whaling industry then boomed in the 1800s, and Lahaina grew into a bustling port town, known worldwide as the whaling capital of the Pacific.

As the whaling industry began to decline, a new populace arrived, heralding the establishment of a new agriculturally-based economy. From the mid-1800s, traditional subsistence agriculture succumbed to commercial agricultural operations, namely sugar plantations. Over the years, a number of smaller mills coalesced into the hugely successful Pioneer Mill Company. By the early 1900s, Pioneer Mill cultivated an estimated 15,000 acres of sugar, blanketing the mountain slopes from Ukumehame to Honokowai (Rosendahl, 1989). During this time, pineapple was also established as a profitable crop, and the fruit was cultivated on lands stretching from Honokowai to Honokohau.

Lahaina has played a significant role in the historical and political evolution of Hawai‘i. As the sandalwood trade flourished, Lahaina became an important commercial shipping port, establishing ties with China and Russia. Upon uniting the Hawaiian islands under his rule, Kamehameha I established Lahaina as his residence and seat of Hawaiian government. Lahaina would remain the capital of the Hawaiian Kingdom until 1843, meanwhile serving as a major hub for the prospering whaling industry.

Lahaina Town was designated a registered National Historic Landmark in 1962, under the provisions of the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935. In 1966, Lahaina Town was listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Notably, the project site is located within the limits of the Lahaina National Historic Landmark District.
b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

In order to obtain a depth in cultural perspectives of the proposed project area, an interview with two knowledgeable informants was conducted during the preparation of the Draft Environmental Assessment. See Appendix “C”.

A Cultural Interview was held with Mr. Howard Kihune and Mr. Harold Mizomi on Thursday, January 8, 2009, at Mr. Kihune’s office in Ka’anapali. Both Mr. Kihune and Mr. Mizomi are lifelong residents of Lahaina.

Mr. Kihune and Mr. Mizomi were respectively born in 1940 and 1935, and in the days of their youth, Lahaina Town was a bustling plantation town built up around the extensive sugar cane operation of Pioneer Mill Company. This was a time when paved streets were a luxury, and the main thoroughfares of Front Street and Honoapi‘ilani Highway were humble dirt roads. A variety of mom-n-pop shops were nestled between Lahainaluna Road and Dickenson Street, lining Front and Waine‘e Streets, and the lands surrounding this center of activity were green with pastures and fields of sugar cane. In recalling those days, Mr. Kihune and Mr. Mizomi illustrated a simple way of life, when trips to Central Maui, the other side, were seldom made, when neighbors passed the time talking story at the local butcher and fish market, and when kids climbed the mango trees beside the irrigation ditches.

Over time, however, Lahaina Town evolved from an agriculturally based plantation town to a tourism-based commercial center, while in the same way, the wetlands and pastures of Ka’anapali yielded to resorts and golf courses. Nevertheless, Mr. Kihune recognized that because of its deep and rich history, Lahaina is a great town; the “old town” that enhances the resort destinations of Ka’anapali and Kapalua. Although many of the quaint shops and plantation-era residences have been replaced, distinctive features of old Lahaina remain: Mr. Kihune maintains his childhood home; Mr. Mizomi resides in the home his family moved to in 1950 after the Korean War; and on a walk down Front Street, some of the original storefronts still remain.

In sum, the men expressed support for the reconstruction of the restaurant, recognizing that the design of the new restaurant would be in keeping with the old-world or plantation era architectural character of the town. In closing, Mr. Kihune and Mr. Mizomi expressed simply that Lahaina is a small town
with a significant history, and in this respect, sensitivity to what it is and what it is about is most important.

Based on State archaeological reviews, land use history, and information gained from the cultural interview, the proposed project is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on cultural resources in the area. The site is located in the midst of the urbanized area of Lahaina Town and has consistently been used for business and quasi-public activities. There are no cultural practices conducted on the property, and the site’s limited size does not raise any adverse implications for cultural practices and resources in the surrounding area.

12. Scenic and Open Space Resources

a. Existing Conditions

The project site is located amidst the business and commercial center of Lahaina Town. While the project site is not part of a scenic corridor, scenic resources in the vicinity include the West Maui Mountains to the east, as well as the Pacific Ocean and the offshore islands of Kaho‘olawe, Lana‘i, and Moloka‘i, all of which can be seen off to the west, beyond the Front Street coastal area. Other open space resources in the region include the vast expanse of former agricultural lands covering the mountain slopes above the existing urbanized areas.

b. Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures

The proposed action involves the demolition and reconstruction of an existing building, as well as minor landscaping and parking improvements. Although located within the National Historic Landmark District, the project site is located outside Maui County Historic Districts Nos. 1 and 2. Nonetheless, to the extent practicable, the design of the proposed project has been developed in accordance with the Lahaina Historic District Design Guidelines. As such, the building's architecture and landscaping will be in keeping with and complementary to the existing townscape. Furthermore, the subject property is not part of a scenic corridor, and will not affect views from inland vantage points. The building height of the new restaurant will
be similar to the existing, and accordingly, the proposed project is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on the visual character of the area.

B. **SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS**

1. **Land Use and Community Character**

   a. **Existing Conditions**

   The majority of lands in West Maui are classified “Conservation” or “Agricultural” by the State Land Use Commission. Generally, higher elevations are deemed “Conservation” lands, while foothills of the middle elevations are designated “Agricultural”. Much of the lower elevations, lands running along the coast, are classified “Urban”.

   Lahaina encompasses a diverse mix of land uses, including residential, business, light industrial, recreational, and agricultural uses. Lahaina Town is the commercial center of West Maui, and the former first capital of the State of Hawai’i. Moreover, as the former whaling capital of the Pacific, Lahaina Town has been designated a National Historic Landmark District. The town contains several shopping centers and business retail areas, serving as a core for the region’s residential communities.

   With a consistently warm, dry climate, complemented by lengths of white sand beaches and scenic landscapes, West Maui is a popular visitor destination. A vast number of visitor accommodations are located in Lahaina Town, as well as in the resort communities of Ka’anapali, Kapalua, Kahana, and Napili. The Kapalua-West Maui Airport at Mahinahina, located approximately 6.9 miles north of the project site, provides commuter air services which conveniently link West Maui with Oahu and neighbor islands.

   Diversified agriculture, including corn, banana, melon, and papaya crops, compose the active agricultural cultivation of the West Maui region. Since the closure of its sugar cane operations in September 1999, Pioneer Mill Company has set aside approximately 1,200 acres of former agricultural lands in Ka’anapali to grow seed corn and coffee.
b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The proposed restaurant reconstruction will enable the applicant to provide a higher level of service to the multitudes of residents and visitors who frequent Lahaina Town's shops and attractions. The operation is complementary to the surrounding businesses, retail and commercial activities, and as such, is not anticipated to adversely alter the community character of West Maui.

2. **Population and Demography**

a. **Existing Conditions**

The project site is located makai of Honoapi'ilani Highway, near the western coast of Lahaina, Maui, within the West Maui Community Plan region.

The County of Maui, specifically the Island of Maui and the West Maui region, has exhibited relatively strong growth over the past decade. In 2000, the population of Maui County was 128,241, compared to a 1990 population of about 100,504. The resident population of the Maui County in 2005 was estimated to be 140,050 and is projected to increase to approximately 151,300 in 2010 (County of Maui, Department of Planning, 2006).

Just as the County’s population has grown, the resident population of the Island of Maui has also increased. In 2000, the estimated population of the Island of Maui was 117,644. It is projected that in 2010 the population will reach approximately 140,289 (County of Maui, Department of Planning, 2006).

West Maui’s growth over the last three (3) decades has kept pace with that of Maui County. Since 1970, West Maui has seen an increase in resident population growing from about 5,500 persons in 1970, to approximately 10,300 persons in 1980, to about 14,600 in 1990. In 2000, the resident population of West Maui was approximately 17,967. Population forecasts for this region reflect a West Maui population of 21,577 persons in 2010. Accounting for visitors and workers, the day-time population increases to approximately 50,000 people in the West Maui region (County of Maui, Department of Planning, 2006).
Age and ethnicity attributes of the West Maui region for the year 2000 are reflected in Table 1.

**Table 1. Age and Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE AND ETHNICITY</th>
<th>Maui County</th>
<th>West Maui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>128,094</td>
<td>17,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>7 percent</td>
<td>7 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19</td>
<td>21 percent</td>
<td>17 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 44</td>
<td>37 percent</td>
<td>42 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>24 percent</td>
<td>24 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>11 percent</td>
<td>10 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>36.8 years</td>
<td>39.3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>34 percent</td>
<td>55 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>10 percent</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>9 percent</td>
<td>6 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>17 percent</td>
<td>13 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>30 percent</td>
<td>21 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


West Maui has a larger percentage of its population in the eligible labor force than the County as a whole. As noted in Table 1, in the year 2000, 66 percent of West Maui’s population is in the labor force age bracket of 20 to 64 years, while Countywide, 61 percent of the population is in this age category. West Maui has a slightly higher median age of 39.3 years, when compared to the Countywide median of 36.8 years.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The proposed action involves the reconstruction of a food service establishment which is currently supported by a resident population of nearly
18,000 full-time residents, in addition to a constant stream of visitors. The proposed action is intended to produce an updated facility necessary to provide quality service for a growing population. The proposed project is not a direct population generator, and as such, is not anticipated to adversely impact population or demographic trends of the West Maui region.

3. Labor Force

a. Existing Conditions

In 2000, there were a total of 21,148 civilian jobs in the Lahaina area, of which 4,703 were self-employed jobs. In January 2010, the non-seasonally adjusted unemployment rates for Maui County and the Island of Maui stood at 8.8 percent and 8.5 percent, respectively, increases of 1.4 percent and 1.2 percent, respectively, from the previous year (DLIR, 2010).

In terms of the profile of employed persons, West Maui generally follows the Countywide trends for the labor force characteristics shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Maui County</th>
<th>West Maui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
<td>2 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2 percent</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4 percent</td>
<td>2 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation,</td>
<td>4 percent</td>
<td>2 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
<td>22 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking &amp; Finance</td>
<td>4 percent</td>
<td>4 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>31 percent</td>
<td>40 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>10 percent</td>
<td>4 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>23 percent</td>
<td>23 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County of Maui, Department of Planning, 2006.

Maui’s economy is heavily reliant upon the visitor industry, and this dependency is especially evident in West Maui, a major resort destination area. In terms of employment distribution, more West Maui workers were
employed in the service industry (40 percent) than the Countywide profile (31 percent). Because of West Maui's emphasis on service jobs, most other job sectors exhibited slightly lower distribution rates.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

As discussed above, the service industry employs 40 percent of the West Maui labor force. In keeping with this trend, the existing restaurant employs a staff of 60, including full-time, part-time, and seasonal personnel. During the construction period, these employees will be given the option of temporarily transferring to another store. In the short term, the project will also support construction and construction-related employment. This project, therefore, is anticipated to positively contribute to labor conditions in the West Maui region.

C. **PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES**

1. **Police and Fire Protection Services**

   a. **Existing Conditions**

   The project site is within the service area of the Maui Police Department's Lahaina patrol district, which services the West Maui region. Built in the early 1970's, the Lahaina Police Station is located in the Lahaina Civic Center (LCC) complex, approximately 2.2 miles north of the project site. The Lahaina patrol district includes management level officers, field police officers, and additional personnel, which consists of public safety aides and administrative support staff (MPD, 2008). In addition, there is also a police sub-station in Napili. This sub-station is used to allow officers assigned in the outskirts of Lahaina to write police reports without having to travel back into Lahaina Town.

   Fire prevention, suppression, and protection services for the West Maui region are provided by the County Department of Fire and Public Safety's Lahaina and Napili Fire Stations. The Lahaina Fire Station is located approximately 2.2 miles north of the project site at the LCC, while the Napili Fire Station is located approximately 8.3 miles further north. The Lahaina Fire Station includes an engine and a ladder company, and is staffed by 30
full-time personnel. It also has a boat for ocean rescues. The Napili Fire Station consists of an engine company with 15 full-time firefighting personnel. All firefighting personnel are first-responder trained to provide emergency medical care.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The proposed action, involving the demolition and reconstruction of an existing restaurant, is not anticipated to affect the capabilities of police and fire services. The existing operational limits of these services will not be extended or affected. Furthermore, onsite fire protection will not be required, as there is an existing fire hydrant on Papalaua Street, fronting the makai boundary of the project site.

2. **Medical Facilities**

a. **Existing Conditions**

Maui Memorial Medical Center serves as the island's only major medical facility. Located in Wailuku, approximately 25.0 miles southeast of Lahaina, the 201-bed facility provides general, acute, and emergency care services for the island's residents and visitors. In addition, the Kaiser Permanente Medical Clinic, West Maui Healthcare Center, Maui Medical Group, Lahaina Physicians, and other private medical and dental offices provide health care services for the region's residents and visitors.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

Because the proposed action involves a reconstruction of and replacement improvements to an existing restaurant, medical and emergency response service limits will not be expanded. The proposed project, therefore, is not anticipated to affect medical services and delivery capacities in the area.

3. **Recreational Facilities**

a. **Existing Conditions**

West Maui has numerous recreational facilities offering diverse opportunities for the region's residents. These facilities include several County and State
parks and beach parks in West Maui. Approximately one-third of the County parks are situated along the shoreline and offer excellent swimming, diving, and snorkeling areas. In addition, Ka’anapali and Kapalua Resorts operate world-class golf courses available for public use.

Recreational facilities in Lahaina Town include the Lahaina Aquatic Center, the West Maui Youth Center, the Lahaina Recreation Center, and the LCC. The Lahaina Aquatic Center contains an Olympic-size swimming pool, a children’s wading pool, a paved parking lot and office and storage space, as well as shower, restroom, and changing room facilities. The 15-acre Waine’e Park expansion includes new fields, parking, and washroom facilities. The West Maui Youth Center has a building for youth activities, as well as paved parking, an outdoor playground, and a basketball court. The Lahaina Recreation Center includes baseball fields and playfields for soccer and football, as well as restrooms and paved parking facilities. The LCC includes a gymnasium, amphitheater, and tennis courts complex, as well as restrooms and paved parking facilities.

Additionally, the clear ocean waters and well-developed reef system along the Lahaina and Ka’anapali coastline offer many recreational opportunities for residents and visitors. Many tourism-based businesses also rely on the ocean and reef system for their operation. Fishing by shorecasting and netting is practiced in the ocean waters near Lahaina Town, Ka’anapali Beach, Hanakao‘o Point, and Honokowai Point. Edible seaweed collecting, octopus fishing, and spearfishing occur on the adjacent reef flat fronting Ka’anapali. During periods of wave activity, the area is a good location for surfing.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The proposed project is not a direct population generator and, as such, is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on recreational facilities in the West Maui region.
4. **Educational Facilities**

a. **Existing Conditions**

The West Maui region is served by four (4) public schools (Lahainaluna High School, Lahaina Intermediate School, Princess Nahiʻenaʻena Elementary School, and Kamehameha III Elementary School) operated by the State of Hawaiʻi, Department of Education (DOE) and two (2) smaller private schools (Sacred Hearts School and Maui Preparatory Academy). All four (4) of the public schools are located within Lahaina Town and three (3) of those schools are located along Lahainaluna Road, mauka of Honoapiʻilani Highway. The enrollments in the four (4) schools have grown in concert with the growth of residential development in the area. See Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment</th>
<th>Projected Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SY 05-06</td>
<td>SY 07-08</td>
<td>SY 08-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahainaluna High School</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahaina Intermediate</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamehameha III Elementary</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Nahiʻenaʻena Elementary</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: State of Hawaiʻi, Department of Education, 2009.*

The University of Hawaii-Maui College (UH-MC), located in Kahului, is the primary higher education institution serving Maui. A UH-MC, Lahaina Education Center opened in Fall 2007.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The proposed project is not a direct population generator and, as such, is not anticipated to impact educational facilities in the region.
5. **Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Services**

a. **Existing Conditions**

Residential refuse collection is provided by the County's Department of Environmental Management, Solid Waste Division. Private refuse collectors provide solid waste disposal services for commercial and institutional accounts. With the exception of the Hana region, residential and commercial solid waste from throughout the island is transported to the Central Maui Landfill at Puunene, about 28.0 miles to the southeast of the project site.

A refuse transfer station located at Olowalu, approximately 6.0 miles south of the project site, accepts household and green wastes, as well as used oil, for transport to the Central Maui Landfill in Puunene. The disposal of commercial and institutional refuse is not permitted at the Olowalu transfer station.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

As applicable, a solid waste management plan will be developed for the disposal of materials resulting from the demolition and construction activities. With regard to waste generated by demolition and construction, to the extent practicable, glass and uncontaminated concrete that meets the definition of “inert fill material” as defined by Section 342H-1, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS), will be reused on-site. Any non-reusable glass and uncontaminated concrete will be disposed of at a State of Hawai‘i, Department of Health (DOH) permitted facility. Treated wood waste and other non-hazardous building components resulting from demolition will also be disposed of at a DOH-permitted facility. The disposal of any hazardous waste resulting from demolition will be handled by a company experienced in abatement remediation, site demolition and removal, and hazardous materials surveying and sampling.

Once completed, solid waste disposal for the restaurant through a private waste collection service would continue. Currently, the County of Maui’s Solid Waste Division is in the process of completing a landfill expansion project, estimated to provide the island with sufficient capacity for several years, which takes into account future growth of residential and non-residential uses. In addition, lands adjacent to the existing landfill are
currently utilized for rock quarrying and will likely be available for County expansion of the landfill, further increasing available capacity.

Aside from the waste generated during the construction period, the proposed action is not anticipated to significantly alter solid waste collection and disposal capabilities and capacities.

D. INFRASTRUCTURE

1. Roadway Infrastructure

a. Existing Conditions

Access to Lahaina is provided by Honoapiʻilani Highway from Central and South Maui. Extending from Wailuku to Kapalua, Honoapiʻilani Highway is the only State highway serving the West Maui region. With the exception of a four-lane segment between Lahainaluna Road and Lower Honoapiʻilani Road, the typical highway section consists of two (2) lanes bordered by paved shoulders which also function as bike paths.

Waineʻe Street fronts the eastern border of the subject property, while Papalaua Street fronts the northern border. As a condition for the construction of the original restaurant in the early 1980s, the County of Maui required McDonald’s to construct roadway improvements along Waineʻe Street. In this regard, the County required the land owner to subdivide and dedicate to the County, an 8-foot-wide parcel of land along the Waineʻe Street frontage, contributing to the widening of Waineʻe Street right-of-way to 56 feet, and to perform corner-rounding improvements at the Waineʻe Street and Papalaua Street intersection. Sidewalks along both the Papalaua and Waineʻe Street frontage are at least five (5) feet in width.

Vehicular access to the project site is currently provided via Papalaua Street. Vehicles currently exit the site onto both Waineʻe Street and Papalaua Street.

b. Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures

A traffic impact assessment report (TIAR) was prepared by Phillip Rowell and Associates. See Appendix “D”.
The study area was limited to Papalaua Street, between Waine‘e Street and the project driveway along the south side of Papalaua Street, and the intersection of Waine‘e and Papalaua Streets. Consistent with observations taken during the collection of traffic counts, the level-of-service (LOS) analysis indicates that all movements currently operate at LOS C or better during the morning peak hour, and at LOS D or better during the afternoon peak hour. The Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) considers LOS D to be the minimum acceptable peak hour LOS for urban intersections; therefore, it has been determined that the existing LOS is acceptable.

The proposed project involves the reconstruction of the existing Lahaina McDonald’s restaurant, and as such, the proposed action does not entail a change in use or a significant increase in the size of the building. In effect, the TIAR concludes that there will be no change in the amount of traffic into or out of the study area, and no mitigation will be required.

2. Water

a. Existing Conditions

The West Maui region is served by the County’s Department of Water Supply domestic water system. The County water system services the coastal areas from Launiupoko to Ka‘anapali and from Honokowai to Napili. The County’s system includes two (2) surface and nine (9) groundwater sources.

The sources of water for Lahaina are five (5) deepwells located above Alaeloa and referred to as Napili Wells 1, 2, and 3, and Honokohau Well A and B; and four (4) wells above Lahaina Town, referred to as Kahana 1 and 2 and Waipuka 1 and 2. These wells are supplemented by water treatment plants above Honokowai and Lahainaluna High School that draw surface water from the Honolua Ditch and Kahana Valley. Several miles of 12- and 16-inch lines located in Lower Honoapi‘ilani Road and two (2) in-line booster stations convey water from these sources to consumers in Lahaina. Storage is provided by a 1.5 million gallon (MG) storage tank above Wahikuli and a 1.0 MG tank on Lahainaluna Road.

The County of Maui provides water service for the existing restaurant establishment. The project site is served by an 8-inch waterline and 1½-inch
water meter. Average water consumption is approximately 2,278 gallons per day.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

The proposed action is not anticipated to increase potable water usage over that which is currently used at the existing restaurant. Because the proposed action involves the reconstruction of an existing establishment, existing domestic and irrigation water service demands will not change. The existing 1 ½-inch water meter is a standard size for McDonald’s restaurants; therefore, a larger meter will not be required. An existing reduced pressure backflow preventer after the water meter will be reused.

3. **Wastewater Systems**

a. **Existing Conditions**

The County Department of Environmental Management's Wastewater Reclamation Division provides sanitary sewer service for the West Maui region.

Wastewater from the Ka’anapali and Lahaina areas is treated at the County's Lahaina Wastewater Reclamation Facility (WWRF). The WWRF's potential total treatment capacity is 9.0 million gallons per day (mgd), with 6.0 mgd for secondary treatment and 3.0 mgd for R-1 treatment. Presently, the facility treats about 5.4 mgd of wastewater. About 1.2 mgd of the R-1 treated effluent is used to irrigate the Royal Ka’anapali golf courses, the landscaped areas along Honoapi‘ilani Highway, and the landscaped median of Ka‘anapali Parkway. The remaining treated effluent (4.2 mgd) is disposed into four (4) injection wells located within the facility. Under the conditions of its Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) permit, the County is allowed to dispose a maximum flow of 6.7 mgd into the injection wells.

b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

Because the proposed action involves the reconstruction of the existing restaurant, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any increased demands on wastewater infrastructure or service requirements. New wastewater fixtures will connect to the existing sewer lateral. While a
property sewer manhole is not currently in existence, a manhole will be installed in order to bring the property into compliance with the requirements of Maui County Code, Section 14.25.A.130. See Appendix "E". As a standard feature of McDonald's restaurants, the existing restaurant contains a grease interceptor. This grease interceptor will be retained with the proposed project. It is noted that condensate from the air-conditioning system does not, and will not, drain to the wastewater system. In effect, no negative impacts to wastewater collection, treatment, or disposal capacities are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

4. **Drainage**

   a. **Existing Conditions**

   The existing restaurant floor elevation is 17.0 feet above mean sea level, and surrounding grades slope away from the building. There are two (2) drain inlets onsite that receive storm runoff from the site. The existing landscaped areas along Papalaua and Waine'e Streets do not flow toward said drain inlets, but rather are directed towards the County roadways. Refer to Appendix "A".

   b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

   The project engineer has investigated a variety of measures for increasing the amount of storm water runoff retained onsite. See Appendix "A-1". The alternatives investigated include the following: (1) increase landscaped area and install a hydrodynamic separator in the downstream drain inlet; (2) utilize landscaped areas for storm water retention; (3) install pervious concrete pavement; and (4) install underground water storage chambers.

   The four (4) design alternatives were assessed in the context of ensuring that the quality of storm water leaving the property is improved over existing conditions, minimizing impacts to offsite drainage systems, and heeding technical limitations associated with the soil composition of the project site. The investigation concluded that the recommended drainage solution involve an increase in landscaped area and the installation of a hydrodynamic separator at the downstream drain inlet. Grades will slope away from the new restaurant and will not vary substantially from the existing. Overall, the
landscaped area will increase by 842 square feet, and the hard surface area will decrease 842 square feet. In effect, storm water runoff will decrease by 0.07 cubic feet per second (cfs), from 1.93 cfs to 1.86 cfs.

The proposed drainage improvements are designed to achieve the objective of reducing storm water runoff while significantly improving the quality of storm water runoff leaving the site. Thus, the proposed project will have a positive impact on drainage conditions.

5. **Electrical, Telephone, and Cable Television Systems**

   a. **Existing Conditions**

   Electrical, telephone, and cable television services for the West Maui region are provided by Maui Electric Company, Ltd., Hawaiian Telcom, and Oceanic Time Warner Cable Company, respectively. These distribution systems, consisting of underground and overhead lines, are located along Honoapi‘ilani Highway.

   b. **Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

   The proposed project will not require capacity-related electrical system improvements, as electricity demands will not increase as a result of the proposed action. There are no improvements to telephone or cable television services involved in the proposed action. The proposed action is not anticipated to have a significant impact on existing electrical, telephone, or cable television systems, nor is it expected to extend existing service area limits.

E. **CUMULATIVE AND SECONDARY IMPACTS**

Cumulative impacts result from the incremental impact of an action when that action is added to other past, present, and foreseeable future actions.

Because the project site was previously disturbed and developed, the proposed action does not pose any significant impacts on environmental resources, local ecosystems, or the surrounding community. The proposed project is not an integral part of a larger growth action.
Secondary impacts are actions taken subsequent to or as a result of implementation of the subject project. The proposed project is not a population generator, and the proposed action does not necessitate an increase in infrastructure systems or public services.
III. RELATIONSHIP TO LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND CONTROLS
III. RELATIONSHIP TO LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND CONTROLS

A. STATE LAND USE DISTRICTS

Chapter 205, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS), relating to the Land Use Commission, establishes four (4) major land use districts classifying all lands of the State of Hawai‘i. These districts are designated as “Urban”, “Rural”, “Agricultural”, and “Conservation”. The subject property is located within the “Urban” district. See Figure 12. The proposed restaurant is a permitted use within the “Urban” district.

B. HAWAI‘I STATE PLAN

Chapter 226, HRS, also known as the Hawai‘i State Plan, is a long-range comprehensive plan which serves as a guide for the future long-term development of the State by identifying goals, objectives, policies, and priorities, as well as implementation mechanisms. Examples of state objectives relevant to the proposed project are as follows:

1. Section 226-5, Objective and policies for population

To achieve the population objective, it shall be the policy of this state to:

a. Manage population growth statewide in a manner that provides increased opportunities for Hawai‘i’s people to pursue their physical, social, and economic aspirations while recognizing the unique needs of each county.

b. Encourage an increase in economic activities and employment opportunities on the neighbor islands consistent with community needs and desires.

2. Section 226-6, Objectives and policies for the economy--in general

Planning for the State's economy in general shall be directed toward achievement of the following objectives:

a. Increased and diversified employment opportunities to achieve full employment, increased income and job choice, and improved living standards for Hawai‘i’s people.
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b. A steadily growing and diversified economic base that is not overly dependent on a few industries, and includes the development and expansion of industries on the neighbor islands.

To achieve the general economic objectives, it shall be the policy of this State to:

a. Expand Hawaii's national and international marketing, communication, and organizational ties, to increase the State's capacity to adjust to and capitalize upon economic changes and opportunities occurring outside the State.

b. Maintain acceptable working conditions and standards for Hawaii's workers.

c. Provide equal employment opportunities for all segments of Hawaii's population through affirmative action and nondiscrimination measures.

3. Section 226-13, Objectives and policies for the physical environment--land, air, and water quality

To achieve the land, air, and water quality objectives, it shall be the policy of this State to:

a. Encourage urban developments in close proximity to existing services and facilities.

The objective of the proposed project is to demolish and reconstruct an existing McDonald's restaurant to meet current corporate design standards. The end result of the proposed action will be a newly outfitted establishment, furnished with updated equipment and facilities, which will enable employees to provide a higher quality of service for both residents and visitors of the area. As discussed previously, the restaurant employs a staff of 60 full-time, part-time, and seasonal employees, providing a steady source of income for many local families. In addition, the restaurant also employs a number of foreign exchange students for several months every year, fostering international economic ties. Meanwhile, the reconstruction of an existing restaurant within an urban area, situated in proximity to other business, commercial, and retail establishments, minimizes impacts to land, air, and water quality in the region. In summary, the proposed project is consistent with the goals, objectives, policies, and priorities of the Hawaii State Plan.
C. MAUI COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

The Maui County General Plan, 1990 Update, sets forth broad objectives and policies to help guide the long-range development of the County. As stated in the Maui County Charter, the General Plan shall:

... indicate desired population and physical development patterns for each island and region within the county; shall address the unique problems and needs of each island and region; shall explain the opportunities and the social, economic, and environmental consequences related to potential developments; and shall set forth the desired sequence, patterns, and characteristics of future developments. The general plan shall identify objectives to be achieved, and priorities, policies, and implementing actions to be pursued with respect to population density; land use maps, land use regulations, transportation systems, public and community facility locations, water and sewage systems, visitor destinations, urban design, and other matters related to development.

The proposed action is in keeping with the following General Plan objectives and policies.

POPULATION

**Objective**

- To plan the growth of resident and visitor population through a directed and managed growth plan so as to avoid social, economic and environmental disruptions.

**Policies**

- Manage population growth so that the County’s economic growth will be stable and the development of public and private infrastructures will not expand beyond growth limits specified in the appropriate community plans or negatively impact our natural resources.

- Provide for population density and distribution patterns within the appropriate community plans which balance with the County’s fiscal ability to provide necessary essential services.
LAND USE

Objective

- To preserve for present and future generations existing geographic, cultural, and traditional community lifestyles by limiting and managing growth through environmentally sensitive and effective use of land in accordance with the individual character of the various communities and regions of the County.

Policies

- Provide and maintain a range of land use districts sufficient to meet the social, physical, environmental and economic needs of the community.

- Formulate a directed land use growth strategy which will encourage the redevelopment and infill of existing communities allowing for mixed land uses, where appropriate.

URBAN DESIGN

Objectives

- To see that all developments are well designed and are in harmony with their surroundings.

- To encourage developments which reflect the character and the culture of Maui County’s people.

Policies

- Require that appropriate principles of urban design be observed in the planning of all new developments.

- Establish urban design guidelines and standards which will reflect the unique traditional and architectural values of each community plan area.

- Encourage community design which establishes a cohesive identity.

The proposed project involves the reconstruction of a food service establishment which provides reliable employment opportunities for residents of the West Maui region. The proposed action will provide an updated facility which will enable the restaurant to provide
a higher quality of service to the growing West Maui population. The location of the subject project, within the business and commercial center of Lahaina Town, is consistent with the land use directives of the General Plan. In addition, the design of the reconstructed restaurant recognizes the key elements of the Architectural Style Book for Lahaina and the Lahaina Historic District Design Guidelines, thereby complementing surrounding buildings and streetscapes. The proposed project, therefore, is in accordance with the objectives and policies of the Maui County General Plan.

It is noted that the County of Maui is currently in the process of updating the General Plan. The updated General Plan document will provide goals, objectives, policies and action items for the County of Maui through the year 2030. Chapter 2.80B of the Maui County Code, relating to the General Plan and Community Plans, implements the foregoing Charter provision through enabling legislation which calls for a Countywide Policy Plan and a Maui Island Plan. The Countywide Policy Plan was adopted as Ordinance No. 3732 on March 19, 2010 and took effect upon signing by the Mayor on March 24, 2010. The Maui Island Plan is currently in the process of review and formulation by the Maui County Council.

With regard to the Countywide Policy Plan, Section 2.80B.030 of the Maui County Code states the following.

The countywide policy plan shall provide broad policies and objectives which portray the desired direction of the County’s future. The countywide policy plan shall include:

1. A vision for the County;
2. A statement of core themes or principles for the County; and
3. A list of countywide objectives and policies for population, land use, the environment, the economy, and housing.

Core principles set forth in the Countywide Policy Plan are listed as follows:

1. Excellence in the stewardship of the natural environment and cultural resources;
2. Compassion for and understanding of others;
3. Respect for diversity;
4. Engagement and empowerment of Maui County residents;
5. Honor for all cultural traditions and histories;
6. Consideration of the contributions of past generations as well as the needs of future generations;

7. Commitment to self-sufficiency;

8. Wisdom and balance in decision making;

9. Thoughtful, island appropriate innovation; and

10. Nurturance of the health and well-being of our families and our communities.

Congruent with these core principles, the Countywide Policy Plan identifies goals objectives, policies and implementing actions for pertinent functional planning categories, which are identified as follows:

1. Natural environment

2. Local cultures and traditions

3. Education

4. Social and healthcare services

5. Housing opportunities for residents

6. Local economy

7. Parks and public facilities

8. Transportation options

9. Physical infrastructure

10. Sustainable land use and growth management

11. Good governance

With respect to the proposed Lahaina McDonald's restaurant reconstruction, the following goals, objectives, policies and implementing actions are illustrative of the project's compliance with the Countywide Policy Plan.
Protect the Natural Environment

**Goal:** Maui County's natural environment and distinctive open spaces will be preserved, managed, and cared for in perpetuity.

**Objective:**

2. Improve the quality of environmentally sensitive, locally valued natural resources and native ecology of each island;

**Policy:**

f. Strengthen coastal-zone management, re-naturalization of shorelines, where possible, and filtration or treatment of urban and agricultural runoff.

**Response:** Drainage system improvements associated with the proposed action involve the installation of a hydrodynamic separator in the downstream onsite drain inlet. This device will serve to remove oils and related petroleum pollutants, as well as 80 percent of the total suspended solids contained in storm water runoff from the onsite paved areas. The filtration of storm water runoff provided by the hydrodynamic separator effects a substantial improvement over existing conditions, wherein runoff is allowed to flow unfiltered into the County drainage system. Refer to Appendix “A-1”.

Improve Physical Infrastructure

**Goal:** Maui County's physical infrastructure will be maintained in optimum condition and will provide for and effectively serve the needs of the County through clean and sustainable technologies.

**Objective:**

4. Direct growth in a way that makes efficient use of existing infrastructure and to areas where there is available infrastructure capacity.

**Policy:**

a. Capitalize on existing infrastructure capacity as a priority over infrastructure expansion.
Response: The proposed project will not require any expansions of existing infrastructure systems. The reconstructed restaurant will utilize standard McDonald’s fixtures, such that no increases in water or wastewater system capacities will be necessitated.

Promote Sustainable Land Use and Growth Management

Goal: Community character, lifestyles, economies, and natural assets will be preserved by managing growth and using land in a sustainable manner.

Objective:

1. Improve land use management and implement a directed-growth strategy.

Policies:

b. Direct urban and rural growth to designated areas.

* * *

e. Encourage redevelopment and infill in existing communities on lands intended for urban use to protect productive farm land and open-space resources.

Response: The project site is located within an existing urban area, and the proposed action involves the reconstruction of an existing building. Neither open space resources nor productive farm land will be affected by the proposed action.

Objective:

3. Design all developments to be in harmony with the environment and to protect each community’s sense of place.

Policies:

c. Protect and enhance the unique architectural and landscape characteristics of each Community Plan Area, small town, and neighborhood.

* * *
f. Use trees and other forms of landscaping along rights-of-way and within parking lots to provide shade, beauty, urban-heat reduction, and separation of pedestrians from automobile traffic in accordance with community desires.

**Response:** The exterior of the proposed restaurant has been specially tailored by a local architect to complement the rustic architectural character of old Lahaina Town. Architectural elements highlighted by the Lahaina Design Guidelines (Winter, 2003) were incorporated into the building design. Reflective of the many whaling-era buildings in Lahaina Town, the proposed restaurant incorporates simple geometric shapes and will utilize materials and colors reminiscent of the historic wooden buildings seen throughout the town. See Appendix “F”. Additionally, shade trees will be planted around the parking area, and expanded landscaped areas will be populated with native ferns, shrubs, and groundcover. Refer to Appendix “B”.

In summary, the proposed Lahaina McDonald’s restaurant reconstruction, is consistent with the themes and principles of the Countywide Policy Plan.

Additionally, included in the draft Maui Island Plan are growth boundary maps, that delineate the limits of proposed urban and rural growth on the island of Maui through the 2030 planning period. The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), made up of citizens of the County of Maui, as well as the County of Maui, Planning Department, and the Maui Planning Commission (MPC) have created draft maps that indicate areas within the proposed Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) and Rural Growth Boundaries (RGB). The proposed Lahaina McDonald’s restaurant site is located within the proposed UGB for the GPAC, the MPC, and the Planning Department’s draft maps. The inclusion of the project site within the draft UGB area indicates that it is an area that is supported for future development. At the same time, the proposed action is in alignment with the intent and directives of the UGB.

## D. WEST MAUI COMMUNITY PLAN

There are nine (9) community plan regions within Maui County. From a General Plan implementation standpoint, each region is governed by a community plan which sets forth desired land use patterns, as well as goals, objectives, policies, and implementing actions for a number of functional areas, including infrastructure-related parameters.
The project site, located within the West Maui Community Plan region, is designated "Business/Commercial". See Figure 13. The proposed project is in keeping with, among others, the following goals, objectives, and policies of the West Maui Community Plan.

**LAND USE**

**Objectives and Policies for Lahaina Town**

- The area bounded by Honoapiilani Highway and Front Street define Lahaina town. Within this core, allow higher density commercial and civic activities with lower density residential uses on the periphery to emphasize the importance of Lahaina town as the regional service center and an attraction to residents and visitors alike.

- Provide resident-oriented commercial uses along Wainee Street from Baker to Dickenson Streets.

**ECONOMIC ACTIVITY**

**Goal**

A diversified economy that provides a range of stable employment opportunities for residents, allows for desired commercial services for the community, and supports the existing visitor and agricultural industries, all in a manner that will enhance both the community's quality of life and the environment.

**Objectives and Policies**

- Promote a diversified economic base which offers long term employment to West Maui residents, and maintains overall stability in economic activity in the areas of:
  
  b. Visitor-related service/commercial services.

  d. Resident-related service/commercial services.

- Expand light industrial and service commercial activities in appropriate locations to accommodate the region's needs.

  a. Enhance Lahaina town’s role as the regional center for resident-related commercial and professional services.
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URBAN DESIGN

Goal

An attractive and functionally integrated urban environment that enhances neighborhood character, promotes quality design at the resort destinations of Kaanapali and Kapalua, defines a unified landscape planting and beautification theme along major public roads and highways, watercourses, and at major public facilities, and recognizes the historic importance and traditions of the region.

Objectives and Policies for Lahaina Town

- Maintain the scale, building massing and architectural character of historic Lahaina town.

- Landscape Character:
  
  a. Open off-street parking facilities should be landscaped and maintained with canopy trees for shade. Parking facility perimeters should be landscaped and maintained with shrubbery to soften the parking edge when viewed from the street. Existing non-conforming parking lots should be made to conform with the current off-street parking ordinance as a prerequisite to future building permits.

  d. Landscaping along Wainee Street and other interior streets should be designed to soften the effects of the built environment and to provide buffers for parking areas.

- Building Character:

  a. New building and renovation of existing buildings in Lahaina town should respect the scale, texture, materials, and facades of existing structures in the Lahaina Historic District.

  b. Building heights should reflect the context of existing building heights and massing in the Lahaina Historic District. The maximum building heights shall be two stories or 35 feet with a mixture of one- to two-story building heights encouraged.
As noted, the proposed project is in conformance with a number of goals, objectives, and policies of the West Maui Community Plan. Comprised of a vibrant mixture of shops, restaurants, and other commercial establishments, Lahaina Town is the activity center of the West Maui region. The proposed project is in keeping with the land use objectives and policies of Lahaina Town, meanwhile contributing to the economic base of the region. Furthermore, the architectural design and landscaping of the proposed project have been developed to respect and contribute to the character of the historic town. Refer to Appendix "F" and refer to Appendix "B". Moreover, the proposed project is consistent with the underlying “Business/Commercial" community plan designation.

E. COUNTY ZONING

The lands underlying the project site is zoned “B-2 Community Business District” by Maui County zoning. According to Maui County Code Section 19.18.020, restaurants are permitted uses within this district; therefore, the proposed project is in conformance with the underlying Maui County zoning designation.

The “B-2 Community Business District” zoning designation was established through Ordinance No. 2827, which was approved by the Maui County Council in February 28, 2000. Conditions of this zoning designation pertinent to the proposed project include the following:

- That the uses on the site shall be limited to business offices, financial offices, and professional offices, as well as uses permitted in the B-1 Neighborhood District, excluding churches, day care, laundromats, gas stations, and liquor stores.

- That the height limit shall be restricted to 35 feet.

- That the architectural design, signage, and landscaping shall be compatible with the Design Guidelines for the Lahaina Historic District.

F. LAHAINA HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES

As mentioned previously, the subject property falls within the boundary of the Lahaina National Historic Landmark District. Although not located in either of the two (2) Lahaina Historic Districts as defined in Title 19.50.010 of the Maui County Code, the following principles of the Lahaina Design Guidelines (Winter, 2003) will be incorporated into the overall design of the proposed restaurant reconstruction, to the extent practicable. Refer to Appendix "F".
1. **Design Character**

   New buildings should be distinguishable as more recent additions to the community, albeit in a subtle way that the overall historic character is conveyed. Regardless of stylistic treatment, a new building should appear simple in form and detail. Buildings should also be visually compatible with older structures, without being direct copies of them.

2. **Mass, Scale, and Form**

   The architecture of Lahaina has been built on simple straightforward geometric principles. A new building’s overall form should be one of simplicity. The mass and scale of buildings in Lahaina are also key considerations that affect compatibility. The overall height, width and depth of the building should reflect those of traditional buildings in the district.

3. **Building Materials**

   New buildings should reinforce the pedestrian-oriented character of Lahaina by conveying a sense of human scale. This can be achieved by using traditional building materials, such as doors, windows, and wood siding, to the extent practicable. The type of materials used should be selected from those used historically in the district; however, if a new material is selected it should have a simple finish, similar to those seen traditionally.

4. **Roof Forms and Materials**

   Simple roof shapes were the predominant form found throughout Lahaina. Roof materials for new buildings should be used in a manner similar to that seen traditionally in the district.

G. **COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT/SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA**

   The Hawai‘i Coastal Zone Management Program (HCZMP), as formalized in Chapter 205A, HRS, establishes objectives and policies for the preservation, protection, and restoration of natural resources of Hawai‘i’s coastal zone. The proposed project site is located within the County of Maui’s Special Management Area (SMA), thus, consideration of County coastal zone objectives and policies will be carried out.
The relationship of the proposed project to applicable coastal zone management considerations, set forth in Chapter 205A, HRS and in the rules of the Maui Planning Commission, is addressed below.

1. **Recreational Resources**

   **Objective:** Provide coastal recreational opportunities accessible to the public.

   **Policies:**

   a. Improve coordination and funding of coastal recreation planning and management; and

   b. Provide adequate, accessible and diverse recreational opportunities in the coastal zone management area by:

      i. Protecting coastal resources uniquely suited for recreation activities that cannot be provided in other areas;

      ii. Requiring replacement of coastal resources having significant recreational value, including but not limited to surfing sites, fishponds and sandy beaches, when such resources will be unavoidably damaged by development; or requiring reasonable monetary compensation to the State for recreation when replacement is not feasible or desirable;

      iii. Providing and managing adequate public access, consistent with conservation of natural resources, to and along shorelines with recreational value;

      iv. Providing an adequate supply of shoreline parks and other recreational facilities suitable for public recreation;

      v. Ensuring public recreational use of County, State and federally owned or controlled shoreline lands and waters having recreational value consistent with public safety standards and conservation of natural resources;

      vi. Adopting water quality standards and regulating point and non-point sources of pollution to protect and where feasible, restore the recreational value of coastal waters;
vii. Developing new shoreline recreational opportunities, where appropriate, such as artificial lagoons, artificial beaches and artificial reefs for surfing and fishing; and

viii. Encouraging reasonable dedication of shoreline areas with recreational value for public use as part of discretionary approvals or permits by the Land Use Commission, Board of Land and Natural Resources, County Planning Commissions and crediting such dedication against the requirements of Section 46-6 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes.

**Response:** The proposed action is not anticipated to impact coastal recreational opportunities or affect existing public access to the shoreline. The project is catered towards providing food service for Lahaina residents and visitors and accordingly, is not a direct generator of demand for regional recreational resources.

2. **Historical/Cultural Resources**

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

**Policies:**

a. Identify and analyze significant archaeological resources;

b. Maximize information retention through preservation of remains and artifacts or salvage operations; and

c. Support State goals for protection, restoration, interpretation and display of historic resources.

**Response:** The project area is located within the Lahaina National Historic Landmark District. The subject property has been previously cleared and graded, and currently contains the existing restaurant and paved parking lot. The property is not considered significant in terms of historic or cultural resource value; however, the exterior design of the new restaurant will be in keeping with the historic architectural character of the area.
3. **Scenic and Open Space Resources**

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

**Policies:**

a. Identify valued scenic resources in the coastal zone management area;

b. Ensure that new developments are compatible with their visual environment by designing and locating such developments to minimize the alteration of natural land forms and existing public views to and along the shoreline;

c. Preserve, maintain and, where desirable, improve and restore shoreline open space and scenic resources; and

d. Encourage those developments which are not coastal dependent to locate in inland areas.

**Response:** The site and proposed reconstruction will be designed and landscaped in accordance with applicable regulatory standards to ensure visual compatibility with the surrounding land uses. The proposed action is not anticipated to impact coastal scenic and open space resources, nor will it adversely affect public views to and along the coastline.

4. **Coastal Ecosystem**

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

**Policies:**

a. Exercise an overall conservation ethic, and practice stewardship in the protection, use and development of marine and coastal resources;

b. Improve the technical basis for natural resource management;

c. Preserve valuable coastal ecosystems of significant biological or economic importance;
d. Minimize disruption or degradation of coastal water ecosystems by effective regulation of stream diversions, channelization, and similar land and water uses, recognizing competing water needs; and

e. Promote water quantity and quality planning and management practices which reflect the tolerance of fresh water and marine ecosystems and maintain and enhance water quality through the development and implementation of point and non-point source water pollution control measures.

**Response:** The project site is not located in close proximity to any streams or wetlands, and the proposed action is not expected to adversely impact coastal ecosystems. The proposed drainage system has been designed in accordance with applicable regulatory standards to ensure that there are no adverse effects to adjacent or downstream properties. Storm water runoff will be reduced by 0.07 cfs with the addition of 842 sq. ft. of landscaped area, while all onsite runoff will be filtered by a hydrodynamic separator prior to entering the County drainage system. Refer to **Appendix “A-1”**. In addition, appropriate BMPs and erosion control measures will be implemented to minimize the effects of stormwater runoff during construction of the project.

5. **Economic Use**

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

**Policies:**

a. Concentrate coastal dependent development in appropriate areas;

b. Ensure that coastal dependent development such as harbors and ports, and coastal related developments such as visitor facilities and energy-generating facilities are located, designed and constructed to minimize adverse social, visual and environmental impacts in the coastal zone management area; and

c. Direct the location and expansion of coastal dependent developments to areas presently designated and used for such developments and permit reasonable long-term growth at such areas, and permit coastal dependent development outside of presently designated areas when:

   i. Use of presently designated locations is not feasible;
ii. Adverse environmental effects are minimized; and

iii. The development is important to the State's economy.

**Response:** The proposed project involves the reconstruction of, and related improvements to, an establishment which is situated within an existing developed area. The proposed action is not an intensification of the existing use of the site; therefore, improvements to public facilities will not be necessary.

6. **Coastal Hazards**

**Objective:** Reduce hazard to life and property from tsunami, storm waves, stream flooding, erosion, subsidence and pollution.

**Policies:**

a. Develop and communicate adequate information about storm wave, tsunami, flood, erosion, subsidence, point and nonpoint source pollution hazards;

b. Control development in areas subject to storm wave, tsunami, flood, erosion, hurricane, wind, subsidence, and point and nonpoint source pollution hazards;

c. Ensure that developments comply with requirements of the Federal Flood Insurance Program; and

d. Prevent coastal flooding from inland projects.

**Response:** The project site falls within Zone X, an area located outside the 0.2 percent annual chance flood plain. Drainage improvements will be designed in accordance with the Drainage Standards of the County of Maui to ensure that the project will not adversely affect downstream and adjoining properties.

7. **Managing Development**

**Objective:** Improve the development review process, communication, and public participation in the management of coastal resources and hazards.

**Policies:**

a. Use, implement, and enforce existing law effectively to the maximum extent possible in managing present and coastal zone development;
b. Facilitate timely processing of applications for development permits and resolve overlapping of conflicting permit requirements; and

c. Communicate the potential short and long-term impacts of proposed significant coastal developments early in their life-cycle and in terms understandable to the general public to facilitate public participation in the planning and review process.

**Response:** All aspects of the development will be conducted in accordance with applicable State and County requirements. Opportunity for review of the proposed action is offered through the Chapter 343, HRS review and SMA permitting processes.

8. **Public Participation**

**Objective:** Stimulate public awareness, education, and participation in coastal management.

**Policies:**

a. Promote public involvement in coastal zone management processes;

b. Disseminate information on coastal management issues by means of educational materials, published reports, staff contact, and public workshops for persons and organizations concerned with coastal-related issues, developments, and government activities; and

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

**Response:** The proposed project is subject to County of Maui SMA proceedings which require a public hearing before the Maui Planning Commission. Opportunities for public awareness, education, and participation in coastal management are provided through these entitlement processes, as well as through the Federal and State regulatory review processes.

9. **Beach Protection**

**Objective:** Protect beaches for public use and recreation.
Policies:

a. Locate new structures inland from the shoreline setback to conserve open space, minimize interference with natural shoreline processes, and minimize loss of improvements due to erosion;

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

c. Minimize the construction of public erosion-protection structures seaward of the shoreline.

Response: The subject property is located approximately 450 feet away from the shoreline and is not anticipated to impact shoreline activities.

10. Marine Resources

Objective: Promote the protection, use and development of marine and coastal resources to assure their sustainability.

Policies:

a. Ensure that the use and development of marine and coastal resources are ecologically and environmentally sound and economically beneficial;

b. Coordinate the management of marine and coastal resources and activities to improve effectiveness and efficiency;

c. Assert and articulate the interests of the State as a partner with federal agencies in the sound management of ocean resources within the United States exclusive economic zone;

d. Promote research, study, and understanding of ocean processes, marine life, and other ocean resources in order to acquire and inventory information necessary to understand how ocean development activities relate to and impact upon ocean and coastal resources; and

e. Encourage research and development of new, innovative technologies for exploring, using, or protecting marine and coastal resources.
Response: BMPs will be incorporated into the construction phase of the project to support the policies of effective management of marine resources.

In addition to the foregoing objectives and policies, SMA permit review criteria, pursuant to Act 244 (2005), provides that:

No special management area use permit or special management area minor permit shall be granted for structures that allow artificial light from floodlights, uplights, or spotlights used for decorative or aesthetic purposes when the light:

(1) Directly illuminates the shoreline and ocean waters; or

(2) Is directed to travel across property boundaries toward the shoreline and ocean waters.

Response: Lighting fixtures for the proposed project will be standard shielded downlighting. The project does not contain lighting which is directed across property boundaries towards the shoreline. It is noted that lighting for the proposed project is primarily intended for purposes of security and customer safety.
IV. SUMMARY OF UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
IV. SUMMARY OF UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The proposed project will result in certain unavoidable construction-related environmental impacts, such as temporary air and noise quality impacts, as outlined in Chapter II.

In the short term, site preparation, construction equipment, and construction activities associated with the proposed action will generate temporary noise impacts. Unavoidable air quality impacts due to the generation of dust and other airborne pollutants will also arise as a consequence of construction. Appropriate BMPs, such as frequent watering of exposed surfaces and regular maintenance of construction equipment, will be incorporated in the construction process to mitigate adverse impacts on the surrounding environment.

In the long term, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse environmental impacts. Once in operation, the reconstructed restaurant is not anticipated to adversely impact the surrounding uses, infrastructure systems, or public services.
V. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION
V. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc. has considered a variety of options in accommodating the proposed project. A summary of these alternatives is described below.

A. PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The proposed development plan outlined in Chapter I represents the preferred alternative. This alternative, which entails the demolition and reconstruction of the existing Lahaina McDonald’s restaurant, presents the most cost-effective and viable alternative, as the capital infrastructure is already in existence onsite.

B. NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

In addition to maintaining present physical conditions at the project site, the “no action” alternative would retain the existing restaurant in its current size and condition. Given the needs for updated equipment, a more functional design of the restaurant, and a more efficient physical layout of the site, the “no action” alternative was not deemed viable. Accordingly, the “no action” alternative was not considered.

C. DEFERRED ACTION ALTERNATIVE

A “deferred action” alternative would have similar consequences as the “no action” alternative, in that the functional objectives of the proposed action would be delayed and not immediately realized. As discussed previously, the existing facility is over 25 years old, and as such is in need of refurbishment. This alternative could potentially result in higher development costs due to increases in labor and material costs or due to changes in infrastructure or the existing physical or socioeconomic environment (i.e. window of opportunity and opportunity costs). Based on the preceding, the “deferred action” alternative was not considered.
D. ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS

As discussed previously, infrastructure and utilities are in existence onsite. The proposed action will take advantage of these existing systems, and demands on existing infrastructure and utilities will not increase as a result of the proposed action. The development of an alternative location could potentially require substantial infrastructure improvements, as well as increased demands on utilities. In the interest of avoiding such impacts, alternative locations were not considered for the proposed action.
VI. IRREVERSIBLE AND
IRRETRIEVABLE
COMMITMENTS OF
RESOURCES
VI. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

The proposed project is anticipated to result in the irreversible and irretreivable commitment of fiscal resources. Land resources were previously committed to support development of the existing establishment. Other resource commitments include energy, labor, and material resources. Impacts relating to the use of these resources should be minimal, especially when weighed against the expected positive socio-economic benefits to be derived from the project, versus the consequences of taking no action.

In addition, the proposed project is not anticipated to require a substantial commitment of government services or facilities, nor is it anticipated to place additional demands on police, fire, medical, and social services, beyond that which is currently required for the existing establishment.
VII. SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA ASSESSMENT
VII. SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA ASSESSMENT

The "Significance Criteria", Section 12 of the Hawai‘i Administrative Rules, Title 11, Chapter 200, "Environmental Impact Statement Rules", were reviewed and analyzed to determine whether the proposed project will have significant impacts to the environment. The following criteria and analysis are provided.

1. **Involves an irrevocable commitment to, loss, or destruction of any natural or cultural resource.**

   The project site and surrounding properties have been previously developed; consequently, there are no known rare, endangered, or threatened species of flora, fauna, or avifauna located within the project site or surrounding vicinity. In addition, there are no known archaeological or culturally significant features in the project vicinity, however, should any cultural artifacts or human remains be encountered during construction, work will stop in the immediate vicinity of the find, and the SHPD will be notified immediately to establish an appropriate mitigation strategy.

   In sum, the proposed project will not result in any adverse environmental impacts, and no natural, cultural, or archaeological resources will be impacted by the proposed action.

2. **Curtails the range of beneficial uses of the environment.**

   The proposed project will not curtail the range of beneficial uses of the environment. Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be employed where needed, to minimize any construction-related impacts to the environment.

3. **Conflicts with the state’s long-term environmental policies or goals and guidelines as expressed in Chapter 344, HRS, and any revisions thereof and amendments thereto, court decisions, or executive orders.**

   The proposed project does not conflict with the State's Environmental Policy and Guidelines as set forth in Chapter 344, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS).
4. **Substantially affects the economic welfare, social welfare, and cultural practices of the community or State.**

In the short term, the proposed project will directly benefit the local economy by providing construction-related employment. In the long term, as discussed previously in Chapter II, the restaurant provides full-time, part-time, and seasonal employment for approximately 60 individuals. Social welfare and cultural practices will not be directly affected by the proposed project.

5. **Substantially affects public health.**

No adverse impacts to public health and welfare are anticipated as a result of the proposed reconstruction.

6. **Involves substantial secondary impacts, such as population changes or effects on public facilities.**

The proposed project is not anticipated to have any adverse effects on public services, such as police, fire, medical, educational, recreational, or solid waste collection services, nor will it have a negative impact on population parameters for the West Maui region. As previously noted, the proposed project involves the replacement of an existing McDonald’s restaurant.

From a land use standpoint, the proposed project is in keeping with the objectives and policies of the West Maui Community Plan, and is complementary to and compatible with surrounding business/commercial uses.

No secondary impacts are anticipated with the proposed project.

7. **Involves a substantial degradation of environmental quality.**

Aside from the short-term impacts related to dust and noise generated during the construction phase, there will not be a degradation of environmental quality. Potential dust, noise, and erosion impacts related to construction activity will be mitigated through utilization of appropriate BMPs.

The proposed drainage system includes the installation of a hydrodynamic separator in the downstream onsite drain inlet. This filter will ensure that all onsite storm
water runoff is rid of oils and related petroleum pollutants, as well as 80 percent of total suspended solids, prior to entering the County drainage system. This entails a substantial improvement over existing conditions wherein storm water runoff leaves the site unfiltered.

The proposed reconstruction is not anticipated to alter the open space and scenic character of the area as the project will demolish and replace an existing building with relatively the same building envelope. Additionally, there are no sensitive environments (e.g., wetlands, streams, erosion prone areas, etc.) which are likely to be affected by the proposed action.

8. **Is individually limited but cumulatively has considerable effect upon the environment or involves a commitment for larger actions.**

   The proposed project does not involve a commitment to larger actions. The impacts assessed in this document are based on the entire action.

9. **Substantially affects a rare, threatened, or endangered species or its habitat.**

   The subject property has been previously developed, and there are no known rare, threatened, or endangered species of flora, fauna, or avifauna found at or around the project site; therefore, no impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

10. **Detrimentally affects air or water quality or ambient noise levels.**

    Construction activities will result in short-term air quality and noise impacts. Dust control measures, such as regular watering and sprinkling, and installation of dust screens will be implemented to minimize wind-blown emissions. Noise impacts will occur primarily from construction equipment. Equipment mufflers or other noise attenuating equipment, as well as proper equipment and vehicle maintenance, will be used during construction activities. Construction noise impacts will be mitigated through compliance with the provisions of the State of Hawai‘i, Department of Health Administrative Rules Title 11, Chapter 46, "Community Noise Control". These rules require a noise permit if the noise levels from construction activities are expected to exceed the allowable levels set forth in the Chapter 46 rules. In addition, no long-term air or water quality or ambient noise level impacts are anticipated.
11. **Affects or is likely to suffer damage by being located in an environmentally sensitive area such as a flood plain, tsunami zone, beach, erosion-prone area, geologically hazardous land, estuary, fresh water, or coastal waters.**

The project site is not located within and would not affect environmentally sensitive areas. The project site is located within Flood Zone X, an area located outside the 0.2 percent annual chance flood plain, and thus is not subject to flooding or tsunami inundation. Soils underlying the project site are not erosion-prone and there are no geologically hazardous lands, estuaries, or coastal waters within or adjacent to the project site. No other foreseeable environmental effects are anticipated in conjunction with the proposed reconstruction.

12. **Substantially affects scenic vistas and viewplanes identified in county or state plans or studies.**

The project site has not been identified as a scenic vista or viewplane, and scenic corridors and open space resources in the area will not be affected. Like the existing restaurant, the new restaurant will be a one-story structure, and as such, the finished height of the new restaurant will be generally the same as the existing restaurant. The design of the reconstructed restaurant will respect the historic character of Lahaina Town; therefore, the visual character of the area will not be adversely impacted.

13. **Requires substantial energy consumption.**

The proposed project will involve a limited commitment of fuel for construction equipment, vehicles, and machinery during construction and maintenance activities. With regard to electricity demands, in the long term, electricity consumption for the reconstructed restaurant will not markedly differ from the existing establishment. In sum, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in substantial consumption of energy resources.

Based on the foregoing analysis, it has been determined that the proposed action will result in a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).
VIII. LIST OF PERMITS AND APPROVALS
VIII. LIST OF PERMITS AND APPROVALS

The following permits and approvals will be required prior to the implementation of the proposed project.

**State of Hawai‘i**

1. Noise Permit (as applicable for construction activities)

**County of Maui**

1. Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit
2. Building Permit
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IX. PARTIES CONSULTED DURING THE PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT; LETTERS RECEIVED; AND RESPONSES TO SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS

The following agencies and organizations were consulted during the preparation of the Draft Environmental Assessment. Agency comments and responses to substantive comments are included in this section.

1. Larry Yamamoto, State Conservationist  
   U.S. Department of Agriculture  
   Natural Resources Conservation Service  
   P.O. Box 50004  
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96850-0001

2. Ranae Ganske-Cerizo, Soil Conservationist  
   Natural Resources Conservation Service  
   U.S. Department of Agriculture  
   700 Hookele Street, Suite 202  
   Kahului, Hawai‘i 96732

3. George Young  
   Chief, Regulatory Branch  
   U.S. Department of the Army  
   U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu  
   Regulatory Branch  
   Building 230  
   Fort Shafter, Hawai‘i 96858-5440

4. Wayne Nastri, Regional Administrator  
   U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
   Region 9  
   75 Hawthorne Street  
   San Francisco, California 94105

5. Gordan Furutani, Field Office Director  
   U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
   500 Ala Moana Boulevard, Suite 3A  
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813-4918

6. Patrick Leonard  
   Field Supervisor  
   U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
   300 Ala Moana Blvd., Rm. 3-122  
   Box 50088  
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

7. Russ K. Saito, State Comptroller  
   Department of Accounting and General Services  
   1151 Punchbowl Street, #426  
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

8. Sandra Lee Kunimoto, Chair  
   Department of Agriculture  
   1428 South King Street  
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96814-2512

9. Georgina K. Kawamura, Director  
   Department of Budget and Finance  
   P.O. Box 150  
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96810
10. Karen Seddon  
    Executive Director  
    Hawai‘i Housing Finance and Development Corporation  
    677 Queen Street  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

11. Theodore E. Liu, Director  
    State of Hawai‘i  
    Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism  
    P.O. Box 2359  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96804

12. Heidi Meeker  
    Planning Division  
    Office of Business Services  
    Department of Education  
    c/o Kalani High School  
    4680 Kahanianaole Highway, #T-B1A  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96821

cc: Lindsay Ball, Complex Area Superintendent (Lanai/Moloka‘i/Hana/Lahaina)

13. Micah Kane, Chairman  
    Department of Hawaiian Home Lands  
    P. O. Box 1879  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96805

14. Chiyoue Fukino, M.D., Director  
    State of Hawai‘i  
    Department of Health  
    919 Ala Moana Blvd., Room 300  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96814

15. Alec Wong, P.E., Chief  
    Clean Water Branch  
    State of Hawai‘i  
    Department of Health  
    919 Ala Moana Blvd., Room 300  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96814

16. Herbert Matsubayashi  
    District Environmental Health Program Chief  
    State of Hawai‘i  
    Department of Health  
    54 High Street  
    Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

17. Laura Thielen, Chairperson  
    State of Hawai‘i  
    Department of Land and Natural Resources  
    P. O. Box 621  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96809

18. Dr. Puualaokalani Aiu, Administrator  
    State of Hawai‘i  
    Department of Land and Natural Resources  
    State Historic Preservation Division  
    601 Kamokila Blvd., Room 555  
    Kapolei, Hawai‘i 96707

19. Hinano Rodrigues  
    Maui/Lanai Islands Burial Council  
    130 Mahalani Street  
    Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

20. Brennon Morioka, Director  
    State of Hawai‘i  
    Department of Transportation  
    869 Punchbowl Street  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

cc: Fred Cajigal

21. Major General Robert G.S. Lee, Director  
    Hawai‘i State Civil Defense  
    3949 Diamond Head Road  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96816-4495

22. Katherine Ke aloha, Director  
    Office Of Environmental Quality Control  
    235 S. Beretania Street, Suite 702  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

23. Clyde Nam’o, Administrator  
    Office of Hawaiian Affairs  
    711 Kapiolani Boulevard, Suite 500  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

24. Abbey Seth Mayer, Director  
    State of Hawai‘i  
    Office of Planning  
    P.O. Box 2359  
    Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96804
25. Dan Davidson, Executive Officer  
State of Hawai’i  
State Land Use Commission  
P.O. Box 2359  
Honolulu, Hawai’i 96804

26. Rosalyn H. Baker, Senator  
Hawai’i State Senate  
Hawai’i State Capitol, Room 210  
415 S. Beretania Street  
Honolulu, Hawai’i 96813

27. Angus L.K. McKelvey, Representative  
House of Representatives  
Hawai’i State Capitol, Room 315  
415 S. Beretania Street  
Honolulu, Hawai’i 96813

28. Charmaine Tavares, Mayor  
County of Maui  
200 South High Street  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

29. Deidre Tegarden, Coordinator  
County of Maui  
Office of Economic Development  
2200 Main Street, Suite 305  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

30. Gen Inumata, Administrator  
Maui Civil Defense Agency  
200 South High Street  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

31. Jeffrey A. Murray, Fire Chief  
County of Maui  
Department of Fire  
and Public Safety  
200 Dairy Road  
Kahului, Hawai’i 96732

32. Lori Tuhako, Director  
County of Maui  
Department of Housing and  
Human Concerns  
One Main Plaza  
2200 Main Street, Suite 546  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

33. Tamara Horcajo, Director  
County of Maui  
Department of Parks and Recreation  
700 Halia Naka Street, Unit 2  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

34. Jeffrey Hunt, Director  
County of Maui  
Department of Planning  
250 South High Street  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

35. Thomas Phillips, Chief  
County of Maui  
Police Department  
55 Mahalani Street  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

36. Milton Arakawa, Director  
County of Maui  
Department of Public Works  
200 South High Street  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

37. Cheryl Okuma, Director  
County of Maui  
Department of Environmental Management  
One Main Plaza  
2200 Main Street, Suite 175  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

38. Donald Medeiros, Director  
County of Maui  
Department of Transportation  
200 South High Street  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

39. Jeffrey Eng, Director  
County of Maui  
Department of Water Supply  
200 South High Street  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

40. Councilmember Jo Anne Johnson  
Maui County Council  
200 South High Street  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

41. Hawaiian Telcom  
60 South Church Street  
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

42. Greg Kauhi, Manager, Customer Operations  
Maui Electric Company, Ltd.  
P.O. Box 398  
Kahului, Hawai’i 96733
43. Theo Morrison, Executive Director
   Lahaina Bypass Now
   505 Front Street, Suite 202
   Lahaina, Hawai’i 96761

44. Keoki Freeland, Executive Director
    Lahaina Restoration Foundation
    120 Dickenson Street
    Lahaina, Hawai’i 96761

45. Karee Karlucci, Executive Director
    Lahaina Town Action Committee
    648 Wharf Street, Suite 102
    Lahaina, Hawai’i 96761

46. Pamela Tumpap, Executive Director
    Maui Chamber of Commerce
    313 Ano Street
    Kahului, Hawai’i 96732

47. Joe Pluta, President
    West Maui Improvement Foundation
    P. O. Box 10338
    Lahaina, Hawai’i 96761

48. Zeke Kalua, Executive Director
    West Maui Taxpayers Association
    P.O. Box 10338
    Lahaina, Hawai’i 96761
Ms. Kimberly Skog  
Munekiyō & Hiraga, Inc.  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

Subject: Early Consultation Request  
Proposed Reconstruction of McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc. Lahaina Restaurant  
Lahaina, Island of Maui  
TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments for the subject project. The proposed project does not impact any of the Department of Accounting and General Services’ projects or existing facilities, and we have no comments to offer at this time.

If you have any questions regarding the above, please have your staff call Mr. David DePonte of the Planning Branch at 586-0492.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

ERNEST Y. W. LAU  
Public Works Administrator

DD:vca  
c: OEQC
December 30, 2008

Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner  
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

Your request for comments on the McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., proposal to demolish and reconstruct the Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant has been reviewed. In accordance with Chapter 343, HRS, we have no substantive pre-assessment comment to provide.

If you should have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Mr. Neal Miyahira, Administrator of the Budget, Program Planning and Management Division at (808) 586-1530.

Aloha,

[Signature]

GEORGINA K. KAWAMURA  
Director of Finance
December 22, 2008

Ms. Kimberly Skog
Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

Subject: Request for Review and Comment on the Proposed Reconstruction of
McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., Lahaina Restaurant
Lahaina, Island of Maui, Hawaii
TMK (2) 4-5-001:019

The Department of Health (DOH), Clean Water Branch (CWB), acknowledges receipt of your
memorandum, dated December 16, 2008, requesting early review and comment on the subject
project in accordance with the requirements of Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR),
Chapter 11-200 (Environmental Impact Statement Rules). The DOH, Office of Environmental
Quality Control (OEQC) administers HAR, Chapter 11-200. Please contact OEQC regarding your
project. The contact information is as follows:

Office of Environmental Quality Control
235 South Beretania Street, Suite 702
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Phone: (808) 586-4185, Fax: (808) 586-4186

The CWB administers HAR, Chapters 11-54 (Water Quality Standards) and 11-55 (Water
Pollution Control). The CWB has reviewed the subject document and offers these comments on
your project. Please note that our review is based solely on the information provided in the
subject document and its compliance with HAR, Chapters 11-54 and 11-55. You may be
responsible for fulfilling additional requirements related to our program. We recommend that
you also read our standard comments on our website at
1. Any project and its potential impacts to State waters must meet the following criteria:
   
a. Antidegradation policy (HAR, Section 11-54-1.1), which requires that the existing uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses of the receiving State water be maintained and protected.

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

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

2. Your December 16, 2008 memorandum indicates that the project area is approximately 0.51 acres. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for discharges of storm water associated with construction activities will not be required if the total project land disturbance (including clearing, demolition, grading, excavation, staging, and stockpiling) is less than one (1) acre of total land area.

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

If you have any questions, please visit our website at http://www.hawaii.gov/health/environmental/water/cleanwater/index.html, or contact the Engineering Section, CWB, at 586-4309.

Sincerely,

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

DL:ml

c: OEQC [via fax 586-4186 only]
January 22, 2009

Alec Wong, P.E., Chief
Clean Water Branch
State Of Hawai‘i
Department of Health
Post Office Box 3378
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96801-3378

SUBJECT: Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Wong:

Thank you for your letter dated December 22, 2008, providing comments on the early consultation request for the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., the following comments are offered in response to your remarks:

The Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC) has been notified of the subject project via the early consultation request. In addition, notice of preparation of the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) will be published in the OEQC bulletin, and a copy of the Draft EA will be submitted to OEQC for review and comment. Meanwhile, the applicant’s civil engineer will review the branch’s standard comments and will incorporate applicable recommendations into the construction plans.

With regards to the specific comments provided, we offer the following information:

1. The project site does not contain, nor lie adjacent to, any State waters; furthermore, the applicant does not anticipate the discharging of wastewater, including storm water runoff, into State waters. Existing drainage conditions will be maintained; nevertheless, the applicant’s civil engineer will evaluate potential impacts to State waters to determine whether or not specific sections of Hawai‘i Administrative Rules (HAR), Section 11-54 are applicable. All discharges related to project construction or operation activities will comply with the relevant State Water Quality Standards. Discharges will be kept at a minimum through the application of engineering Best Management Practices (BMPs).
2. The applicant acknowledges that because the project site measures under one (1) acre (approximately 0.51 acre), a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit will not be required for the subject project.

3. All discharges related to project construction or operation activities will comply with the applicable State Water Quality Standards, as specified in HAR, Section 11-54, and/or permitting requirements as specified in HAR, Section 11-55. Discharges will be kept to a minimum through the application of engineering BMPs.

Your input on the proposed action is greatly appreciated. A copy of the Draft EA will be provided to your office for review and comment. Should you require additional information, or should any questions arise in regards to the subject project, please feel free to contact me at (808) 244-2015 or email kim@mhplanning.com.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
Conrad Shiroma, Kim & Shiroma Engineers, Inc.

F:\DATA\McDonalds\Lahaina\D0H\CW8.eces.wpd
December 30, 2008

Ms. Kimberly Skog
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

Subject: Early Consultation Request for Proposed Reconstruction of McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawai‘i, Inc.
TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the early consultation process for the proposed project. The following comments are offered:

1. The noise created during the construction phase of the project may exceed the maximum allowable levels set forth in Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR), Chapter 11-46, “Community Noise Control”. A noise permit may be required and should be obtained before the commencement of work.

2. HAR, Chapter 11-46 sets maximum allowable sound levels from stationary equipment such as compressors and HVAC equipment. The attenuation of noise from these sources may depend on the location and placement of these types of equipment. This should be taken into consideration during the planning, design, and construction of the building and installation of these types of equipment.

It is strongly recommended that the Standard Comments found at the Department’s website: [http://hawaii.gov/health/environmental/env-planning/landuse/landuse.html](http://hawaii.gov/health/environmental/env-planning/landuse/landuse.html) be reviewed, and any comments specifically applicable to this project should be adhered to.

Should you have any questions, please call me at 808 984-8230.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Herbert S. Matsubayashi
District Environmental Health Program Chief
January 22, 2009

Herbert S. Matsubayashi, Chief
State of Hawai‘i
Department of Health
Maui District Office
54 High Street
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

SUBJECT: Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction at
TMK (2) 4-5-001-019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Matsubayashi:

Thank you for your letter dated December 30, 2008, providing comments on the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we wish to provide the following information in response to your comments.

With regard to your first comment, the applicant will work to ensure all necessary permits are in place prior to the start of construction. Second, the applicant acknowledges the maximum allowable sound levels from stationary equipment, as set forth by Hawai‘i Administrative Rules (HAR), Chapter 11-46. You have the applicant’s assurances that Best Management Practices, such as the use of equipment mufflers and sound attenuating devices, will be utilized, as necessary, during the construction period. In addition, all construction activities will be limited to normal, daylight working hours. Lastly, the applicant has noted the availability of standard comments at the Department of Health website. The list will be reviewed, and where applicable, these comments will be addressed.
Your input on the proposed action is greatly appreciated. A copy of the Draft Environmental Assessment will be provided to your office for review and comment. Should you require additional information, or should any questions arise in regards to the subject project, please feel free to contact me at (808) 244-2015 or email kim@mhplanning.com.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawai'i, Inc.
January 15, 2009

Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Maui, HI 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

SUBJECT: Chapter 6E-10 and 6E-42(HRS) Review
McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Lahaina Restaurant – Demolition of Existing Structure and Reconstruction of McDonald’s Restaurant
Located at 885 Waiea Street (Lahaina Historic Landmark District)
Lahaina, Island of Maui, Hawaii
TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019

This is in regards to the building applications for the demolition of an existing structure and reconstruction located within the Lahaina Historic Landmark (NHL) District (12/29/1962). Our determination for this review is “effect, with agreed-upon mitigation commitments.”

We have no comments on the demolition of the existing structure that was built in 1983 since it is less than 50 years old, therefore not qualifying as a contributing element to the NHL. However, we have concerns that proposed new construction will have an effect on the Lahaina NHL District, and refer you to the Lahaina Historic District Design Guidelines. We look forward to submittal of design developments of the new structure for our review and comment.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Archaeology concerns will be addressed separately. Should you have any questions regarding architectural concerns, please call Susan Tasaki at (808) 692-8015.

Sincerely,

Astrid M.B. Liverman, Ph.D.
Architecture Branch Chief

c: Dr. Elaine Jackson-Retondo, Architectural Historian, Pacific West Region, Department of the Interior, National Park Service, [Elaine_Jackson-Retondo@nps.gov]

Mr. Stanley Solamillo, Planner, Department of Planning, County of Maui, 250 South High Street, Wailuku, Maui, HI 96793

County of Maui, Development Services, Building Permit Section, 250 South High Street, Wailuku, Maui, HI 96793

Ms. Jenny Pickett, SHPD Archaeology Branch, Maui Island
February 10, 2009

Astrid M. B. Liverman, PhD
Architecture Branch Chief
State of Hawai‘i
Department of Land and Natural Resources
State Historic Preservation Division
601 Kamokila Boulevard, Room 555
Kapolei, Hawai‘i 96707

SUBJECT: Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2)
4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Dear Dr. Liverman:

Thank you for your letter dated January 15, 2008, providing comments on the early consultation request for the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., the following comments are offered in response to your remarks:

McDonald’s has anticipated the need for an exterior design for their proposed replacement facility that responds to Lahaina’s unique architectural heritage. To this end, they have retained Jim Niess of Maui Architectural Group, a firm with a sound reputation for plantation era vernacular design, to assist in this effort. They will be utilizing the Architectural Style Book for Lahaina, along with an inventory of historic Lahaina commercial buildings, as a guideline to create a façade that is compatible with structures in the Historic District. In this regard, the Lahaina Historic District Design Guidelines will also serve as an indispensable resource. Colored architectural renderings and elevations will be included in the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA); a copy of which will be provided to your office for review and comment.
Your comments on the proposed action are greatly appreciated. Should you require additional information, or should any questions arise in regards to the subject project, please feel free to contact me at (808) 244-2015 or email kim@mhplanning.com.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawai'i, Inc.
    Jim Niess, Maui Architectural Group, Inc.
Ms. Kimberly Skog  
Planner  
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

Subject: Proposed Reconstruction of McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc, Lahaina Restaurant - Early Consultation

Thank you for requesting the State Department of Transportation’s (DOT) review of the subject project.

DOT does not anticipate any adverse, significant impacts to its transportation infrastructure resulting from the proposed project to demolish and reconstruct the Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant located on the corner of Papalaua Street and Waine’e Street in Lahaina.

DOT appreciates the opportunity to provide comments. If there are any questions, please contact Mr. David Shimokawa of the Statewide Transportation Planning staff at (808) 587-2356.

Very truly yours,

BRENNON T. MORIOKA, PH.D., P.E.  
Director of Transportation
December 23, 2008

Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

Early Consultation Request, Proposed Reconstruction of McDonalds Restaurant
Lahaina Restaurant at TMK (2)4-5-001:019 Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this development. After careful review of the documents for this project, we have no comments at this time.

We anticipate reviewing the draft Environmental Assessment, and will make any appropriate recommendations at that time. If you have any questions, please call Mr. Richard Stercho, Hazard Mitigation Planner, at (808) 733-4300, ext. 583.

Sincerely,

EDWARD T. TEIXEIRA
Vice Director of Civil Defense
December 29, 2008

Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, HI 96793

RE:  Request for comments on the proposed reconstruction of McDonald's Restaurants of Hawai'i, Inc., Lahaina Restaurant, Lahaina, Maui, TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019.

Aloha e Kimberly Skog,

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) is in receipt of the above-mentioned letter dated December 16, 2008. The proposed project would allow for the demolition and reconstruction of the Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant to upgrade the building to current corporate branding standards. OHA has reviewed the project and offers the following comments.

OHA has substantive obligations to protect the cultural and natural resources of Hawai'i for its beneficiaries, the people of this land. The Hawaii Revised Statutes mandate that OHA "serve as the principal public agency in the State of Hawaii responsible for the performance, development, and coordination of programs and activities relating to native Hawaiians and Hawaiians; ... and [t]o assess the policies and practices of other agencies impacting on native Hawaiians and Hawaiians, and conducting advocacy efforts for native Hawaiians and Hawaiians." (HRS § 10-3)

We look forward to the opportunity to review the forthcoming Draft Environmental Assessment with its required Cultural Impact Assessment. We also request the applicant's assurances that should iwi kūpuna or Native Hawaiian cultural or traditional deposits be found during the construction of the project, work will cease, and the appropriate agencies will be contacted pursuant to applicable law.

In addition, OHA recommends that the applicant use native vegetation in its landscaping plan for subject parcel. Landscaping with native plants furthers the traditional Hawaiian concept of mālama ʻāina and creates a more Hawaiian sense of place.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have further questions, please contact Heidi Guth at (808) 594-1962 or e-mail her at heidig@oha.org.

ʻO wau iho nō me ka ʻoiaʻiʻo,

[Signature]

Clyde W. Namu'oe
Administrator

C: OHA Maui CRC Office
January 22, 2009

Clyde W. Nāmu’o
State of Hawai‘i
Office of Hawaiian Affairs
711 Kapi‘olani Boulevard, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

SUBJECT: Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at
TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Nāmu’o:

Thank you for your letter dated December 29, 2008, providing comments on the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we wish to provide the following information in response to your comments.

The applicant affirms that a copy of the Draft Environmental Assessment, which will include a Cultural Impact Assessment, will be provided for your review. Furthermore, you have the applicant’s assurances that in the event any items of Native Hawaiian cultural or traditional significance are inadvertently encountered during construction, work will cease and the appropriate agencies will be notified immediately.

The applicant acknowledges the cultural and environmental significance of using native vegetation in landscaping for the proposed project. While native plants are best suited to the local environment, landscaping with native vegetation also contributes to the creation of a Hawaiian sense of place, thereby furthering the concept of mālama ‘āina. In this regard, landscaping for the proposed project will include native plants to the extent practicable.
Your input on the proposed action is greatly appreciated. Again, a copy of the Draft Environmental Assessment will be provided to your office for review and comment. Should you require additional information, or should any questions arise in regards to the subject project, please feel free to contact me at (808) 244-2015 or email kim@mhplanning.com.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawai‘i, Inc.
    Kevin Tanaka, Landscape Architect
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Kimberly Skog
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

January 5, 2009

Dear Ms. Skog:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the upcoming demolition and reconstruction of McDonald’s Restaurant located at the corner of Papalaua Street and Waine’e Street in Lahaina. My administration is in favor of this project moving forward through the process as required by the State of Hawaii, HRS, Chapter 343 and also the County of Maui Special Management Area requirements. We all look forward to the completion of the new Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant.

Sincerely,

CHARMAINE TAVARES
Mayor, County of Maui

CT:rs/ec
February 2, 2009

Ms. Kimberly Skog
Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

SUBJECT: MCDONALD’S RESTAURANT - RECONSTRUCTION OF LAHAINA RESTAURANT EARLY CONSULTATION REQUEST TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, LAHAINA

Dear Ms. Skog,

We reviewed the subject project as a pre-application consultation and have the following comments:

1. Solid Waste Division comments:
   a. Include a plan for recycling/reuse of construction/demolition waste.

2. Wastewater Reclamation Division (WWRD) comments:
   a. Although wastewater system capacity is currently available as of 2/2/2009, the developer should be informed that wastewater system capacity cannot be ensured until the issuance of the building permit.
   b. Wastewater contribution calculations are required before building permit is issued.
   c. Developer is not required to pay assessment fees for this area at the current time.
   d. Developer is required to fund any necessary off-site improvements to collection system and wastewater pump stations.
   e. Plans should show location of the existing sewer service lateral and property sewer manhole. If a property sewer manhole does not exist, one needs to be installed.
   f. Kitchen facilities within the proposed project shall comply with pretreatment requirements (including grease interceptors, sample boxes, screens etc.).
g. Non-contact cooling water and condensate should not drain to the wastewater system.

If you have any questions regarding this memorandum, please contact Gregg Kresge at 270-8230.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Cheryl Okuma, Director
April 8, 2009

Cheryl Okuma, Director  
County of Maui  
Department of Environmental Management  
2200 Main Street, Suite 100  
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

SUBJECT: Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2)  
4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Dear Ms. Okuma:

Thank you for your letter dated February 2, 2009, providing comments on the early consultation request for the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., the following comments are offered in response to your remarks:

1. **Solid Waste Division Comment:**
   a. A plan for the recycling/reuse of construction and demolition waste will be included within the project’s construction specifications.

2. **Wastewater Reclamation Division Comments:**
   a. The proposed action involves the reconstruction of an existing restaurant; as such, wastewater system capacity requirements will not increase over current levels.
   b. Wastewater contribution calculations will be provided to the Department upon submittal of the building permit application.
   c. The applicant acknowledges that assessment fees are not required at this time.
   d. As discussed in Item 2.a. above, wastewater system requirements will not increase as a result of the proposed action, therefore, off-site improvements to collection system and wastewater pump stations are not anticipated.
Please refer to Exhibit 1 which depicts the location of the existing sewer service lateral. Because a property sewer manhole does not exist at this time, the applicant's civil engineer will ensure a manhole is installed, per code requirements. Civil engineering plans will be included with the Draft EA.

As a standard feature of McDonald's restaurants, the existing restaurant contains a grease interceptor. The proposed project will retain the existing grease interceptor, thereby maintaining compliance with applicable pretreatment requirements.

McDonald's restaurants do not utilize equipment cooled by non-contact cooling. Condensate from the air-conditioning system is received by dry wells and does not drain to the wastewater system.

Your input on the proposed action is greatly appreciated. A copy of the Draft EA will be provided to your office for review and comment.

Should you require additional information, or should any questions arise in regards to the subject project, please feel free to contact me at (808) 244-2015 or email kim@mhpplanning.com.

Very truly yours,
Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
Enclosure
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc. (w/enclosure)
    Conrad Shiroma, Kim & Shiroma Engineers, Inc. (w/enclosure)
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
Attention: Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, HI 96793

Subject: Early Consultation Request for McDonald’s Lahaina, TMK: (2)4-5-001:019

Dear Ms. Skog,

I have received your request concerning the reconstruction of the Lahaina McDonalds. I also understand that the project has triggered an EA since it is within the Historical District.

At this time, we do not have any concerns. We will look at the project during the building permit process. Please feel free to contact me if there are any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Valeriano F. Martin
Captain
Fire Prevention Bureau
December 29, 2008

Ms. Kimberly Skog  
Planner  
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

SUBJECT: Early Consultation Request for Proposed Reconstruction of McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawai‘i, Inc., Lahaina Restaurant at TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

We have reviewed the Early Consultation Request for the above subject project and would like to inform you that we do not have any comment to offer.

Please call Mr. Wayde Oshiro of our Housing Division at 270-7355 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

LORI TSUHAKO  
Director of Housing and Human Concerns

cc: Housing Division
December 29, 2008

Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
Attention: Kimberly Skog, Planner
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

SUBJECT: Early Consultation Request for Proposed Reconstruction of McDonald's Restaurants of Hawai‘i, Inc., Lahaina Restaurant at TMK (2) 4-5-001: 019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Dear Ms. Skog:

Based on our review of the proposed reconstruction of the Lahaina McDonald's restaurant on the corner of Papalaua Street and Waine‘e Street, the Parks Department does not have any comments at this time.

Please feel free to contact me or Mr. Patrick Matsui, Chief of Parks Planning and Development, at 270-7387 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

For

TAMARA HORCAJO
Director

xc: Baron Sumida, CIP Coordinator Parks Planning & Development
Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, HI 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

SUBJECT: Early Consultation Request for Proposed Reconstruction of McDonald's Restaurants of Hawai'i, Inc. Lahaina Restaurant
TMK (2) 4-5-001:019

Thank you for your letter of December 16, 2008, requesting comments on the above subject.

We have reviewed the information submitted for this project and would like to defer any comments or recommendations at this time. We look forward to receiving the Environmental Assessment and hope we will have an opportunity to review and comment on.

Very truly yours,

Assistant Chief Wayne T. Ribao
for: Thomas M. Phillips
Chief of Police

c: Jeffrey Hunt, Planning Department
Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner  
MUNEKIYO & HIRAGA, INC.  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

SUBJECT: EARLY CONSULTATION REQUEST FOR PROPOSED RECONSTRUCTION OF MCDONALD’S RESTAURANTS OF HAWAII, INC.

We received your request for early consultation and offer the following comment:

1. Obtain all necessary building permits.

Please call Michael Miyamoto at 270-7845 if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

MILTON M. ARAKAWA, A.I.C.P.  
Director of Public Works

MMA: MMM: Is  
xc: Highways Division  
Engineering Division  
S:\LUCA\CZM\Draft Comments\Prop_McDonalds_recons_ec_45001019_1s.wpd
February 5, 2009

Milton Arakawa, Director
County of Maui
Department of Public Works
200 South High Street, Room 434
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

SUBJECT: Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2)
4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Arakawa:

On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we thank you for your letter dated January 15, 2008, providing comments on the early consultation request for the subject project. With regard to your comment, you have the applicant’s assurances that all necessary building permits will be obtained prior to construction.

A copy of the Draft Environmental Assessment will be provided to your office for review and comment. Should you require additional information, or should any questions arise in regards to the subject project, please feel free to contact me at (808) 244-2015 or email kim@mhplanning.com.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawai‘i, Inc.

305 High Street, Suite 104 - Wailuku, Hawaii 96793 - ph: (808)244-2015 - fax: (808)244-8729 - planning@mhplanning.com - www.mhplanning.com
January 2, 2009

Ms. Kimberly Skog
Munekiyo & Hiraga Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii 96793

Subject: Early Consultation Request for Proposed Reconstruction of McDonalds Restaurant located in Lahaina

Dear Ms. Skog,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. We have no comments to make at this time.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Don Medeiros
Director
December 31, 2008

Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
Attention: Kimberly Skog, Planner
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

RE: Early Consultation Request for Proposed Reconstruction of McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawai‘i, Inc., Lahaina Restaurant at TMK (2)4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Early Consultation Request.

Source Availability and Consumption
The project site is served by the Department of Water Supply’s Lahaina system. The main sources of water for the system are wells from the Launiupuko aquifer and surface water from the Kanaha Stream. Additional water for the project is not currently available within the Lahaina system, pending the completion of new source projects. Should a larger meter be required for the project site, the Department does not guarantee that additional source will be available for the project.

The project site is served a 1½-inch water meter. The existing facility has an average water consumption of about 2,278 gallons per day.

System Infrastructure
The project site is served by a 8-inch waterline and a fire hydrant fronting the site. During the building permit process, the applicant will be required to submit domestic, irrigation and fire flow calculations to determine water meter capacity and adequate fire protection. The applicant must also install a reduced pressure back-flow prevention device approved by the Department if one does not already exist.

Conservation
In order to reduce the demand on the Lahaina system, the Department recommends that native plants be utilized for landscaping. Native plants adapted to the area conserve water and protect

"By Water All Things Find Life"

The Department of Water Supply is an Equal Opportunity provider and employer. To file a complaint of discrimination, write: USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20250-9410. Or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD)
the watershed from degradation due to invasive alien species. The project site is located the Maui County Planting Plan - Plant Zone 3, Warm to Hot Elevations. A list of plants is enclosed.

The applicant should also consider the following conservation measures:
1. **Use brackish and/or reclaimed water sources** for dust control and for non-potable uses during construction.
2. **Utilize Low-Flow Fixtures and Devices:** Maui County Code Subsection 16.20A.680 requires the use of low-flow water fixtures and devices in faucets, showerheads, urinals, water closets and hose bibs.
3. **Maintain fixtures to Prevent Leaks:** A simple, regular program of repair and maintenance can prevent the loss of hundreds or even thousands of gallons of water per day.
4. **Limit Irrigated Turf:** Low-water use plants and ground cover can be equally attractive and require substantially less water than turf.
5. **Prevent Over-Watering by Automated Systems:** Provide rain-sensors on all automated controllers. Check and reset controllers at least once a month to reflect the monthly changes in evaporation rates at the site. As an alternative, provide more automated, soil-moisture sensors on controllers.
6. **Look for Opportunities to Conserve Water:** A few examples include: a) use a broom instead of water hose to clear debris on the property; b) check for leaks in toilets, faucets and pipes.

**Pollution**

In order to protect groundwater resources, the Department encourages the applicant to adopt best management practices (BMPs) to prevent infiltration and runoff. Please refer to the enclosed BMP “Source Water Protection Practices Bulletin - Managing Storm Water Runoff to Prevent Contamination of Drinking Water”.

Should you have any questions, please contact our Water Resources & Planning Division at 244-8550.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY K. ENG, DIRECTOR


List from Maui County Planting Plan - Plant Zone 3, Warm to Hot Elevations

c: Engineering Division

WRPD file
Source Water Protection Practices Bulletin
Managing Storm Water Runoff to Prevent Contamination of Drinking Water

Storm water runoff is rain or snow melt that flows off the land, from streets, roof tops, and lawns. The runoff carries sediment and contaminants with it to a surface water body or infiltrates through the soil to ground water. This fact sheet focuses on the management of runoff in urban environments; other fact sheets address management measures for other specific sources, such as pesticides, animal feeding operations, and vehicle washing.

SOURCES OF STORM WATER RUNOFF

Urban and suburban areas are predominated by impervious cover including pavements on roads, sidewalks, and parking lots; rooftops of buildings and other structures; and impaired pervious surfaces (compacted soils) such as dirt parking lots, walking paths, baseball fields and suburban lawns.

During storms, rainwater flows across these impervious surfaces, mobilizing contaminants, and transporting them to water bodies. All of the activities that take place in urban and suburban areas contribute to the pollutant load of storm water runoff. Oil, gasoline, and automotive fluids drip from vehicles onto roads and parking lots. Storm water runoff from shopping malls and retail centers also contains hydrocarbons from automobiles. Landscaping by homeowners, around businesses, and on public grounds contributes sediments, pesticides, fertilizers, and nutrients to runoff. Construction of roads and buildings is another large contributor of sediment loads to waterways. In addition, any uncovered materials such as improperly stored hazardous substances (e.g., household cleaners, pool chemicals, or lawn care products), pet and wildlife wastes, and litter can be carried in runoff to streams or ground water. Illicit discharges to storm drains (e.g., used motor oil), can also contaminate water supplies.

Storm water is also directly injected to the subsurface through Class V storm water drainage wells. These wells are used throughout the country to divert storm water runoff from roads, roofs, and paved surfaces. Direct injection is of particular concern in commercial and light industrial settings (e.g., in and around material loading areas, vehicle service areas, or parking lots).
WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO MANAGE STORM WATER RUNOFF NEAR THE SOURCES OF YOUR DRINKING WATER?

Impervious areas prohibit the natural infiltration of rainfall through the soil, which could filter some contaminants before they reach ground water. Also, impervious surfaces allow the surface runoff to move rapidly. Development reduces the amount of land available for vegetation, which can mitigate the effects of rapid runoff and filter contaminants. When the percentage of impervious cover reaches 10 to 20 percent of a watershed area, degraded water quality becomes apparent.

There are three primary concerns associated with uncontrolled runoff: (1) increased peak discharge and velocity during storm events resulting in flooding and erosion; (2) localized reduction in recharge; and (3) pollutant transport.

When runoff is confined to narrow spaces, such as streets, the velocity at which water flows increases greatly with depth. This contributes to erosion in areas without vegetation cover, increased flooding in low lying areas, and sedimentation in surface water bodies. Sediment deposited in streams can increase turbidity, provide transport media for pathogenic bacteria and viruses, and decrease reservoir capacity. Sediments also smother aquatic species, leading to habitat loss and decreased biodiversity of aquatic species. The fast-running runoff is not afforded an opportunity to infiltrate into the subsurface, and ground waters are not recharged by rain events.

EPA considers nonpoint source pollution, including storm water runoff, to be one of the most important sources of contamination of the nation’s waters. According to a nationwide study, 77 of 127 priority pollutants tested were detected in urban runoff. Some of the principal contaminants found in storm water runoff include heavy metals, toxic chemicals, organic compounds, pesticides and herbicides, pathogens, nutrients, sediments, and salts and other de-icing compounds. Some of these substances are carcinogenic; others lead to reproductive, developmental, or other health problems that are associated with long-term exposure. Pathogens can cause illness, even from short-term exposure, that can be fatal to some people.

Urban runoff is commonly collected in storm sewers and discharged to waterways untreated, so that any contaminants carried by the storm water are discharged to surface water bodies that are used as the sources of drinking water. In addition, about 20 percent of the population in the U.S. is served by combined sewer systems (for both sanitary waste and storm water) that, during heavy storm events, allow contaminants from sanitary sewage to discharge directly to waterways untreated.

AVAILABLE PREVENTION MEASURES TO ADDRESS STORM WATER RUNOFF

A variety of management practices, including pollution prevention and treatment devices, are available to abate storm water pollution. The most effective storm water pollution prevention plans combine these measures and reflect local soil, precipitation, and land use conditions. Some of the more widely-used management measures are described below.
Please keep in mind that individual prevention measures may or may not be adequate to prevent contamination of source waters. Most likely, individual measures should be combined in an overall prevention approach that considers the nature of the potential source of contamination, the purpose, cost, operational, and maintenance requirements of the measures, the vulnerability of the source waters, the public's acceptance of the measures, and the community's desired degree of risk reduction.

Pollution source control and prevention measures include public education to homeowners and business owners on good housekeeping, proper use and storage of household toxic materials, and responsible lawn care and landscaping; storm drain stenciling; hazardous materials collection; and eliminating illicit discharges. The incorporation of best management practices (BMPs) in building and site-development codes, if feasible, should be encouraged. On roadways, proper maintenance of rights-of-way, control of chemical and nutrient applications, street cleaning or sweeping, storm drain cleaning, use of alternative or reduced de-icing products, and equipment washing can reduce the pollutant content of runoff.

Without appropriate erosion and sedimentation control (ESC) measures, construction activities can contribute large amounts of sediment to storm water runoff. Erosion can be controlled by planting temporary fast-growing vegetation, such as grasses and wild flowers. Covering top soil with geotextiles or impervious covers will also protect it from rainfall. Good housekeeping measures for construction sites include construction entrance pads and vehicle washing to keep sediment and soil on-site. Construction should be staged to reduce soil exposure, or timed to coincide with periods of low rainfall and low erosion potential, such as in the fall, rather than during spring rains. Other measures include sediment traps and basins; sediment fences; wind erosion controls; and sediment, chemical, and nutrient control.

If available, ordinances and regulations on construction activities can require plan reviews to ensure that erosion during construction is minimized or require ESC measures during construction. Inspections of ESC measures and repair of controls where needed will maintain the working order of these controls and maximize their benefit.

Local governments can use a variety of land use controls to protect source water from potential contamination. For example, subdivision controls help to ensure that expected development will not compromise drinking water quality or ground water recharge. Requiring proper storm water management in new developments and redevelopments will ensure that runoff does not become excessive as areas of paved surfaces increase. Low impact development incorporates maintaining pre-development hydrology, considering infiltration technology, and re-routing water to recharge the aquifer.

Minimizing directly connected impervious areas (DCIAs) is important to reducing the flow and volume of runoff. Planners should direct runoff from roofs, sidewalks, and other surfaces over grassed areas to promote infiltration and filtration of pollutants prior to surface water deposition. Porous design of parking lots also provides places for storm water to infiltrate to soils. Concrete grid pavement is typically placed on a sand or gravel base with void areas filled with pervious materials such as sand, gravel, or grass. Storm water percolates through the voids into the subsoil. Planting landscaped areas lower than the street level encourages drainage.

Structural designs are used to control runoff or temporarily store storm water on site. A number of structural devices have been developed to encourage filtration, infiltration, or settling of suspended particles. Some of the more commonly-used practices are described below.
**Grassed swales** are shallow, vegetated ditches that reduce the speed and volume of runoff. Soils remove contaminants by infiltration and filtration. Vegetation, or turf, prevents soil erosion, filters out sediment, and provides some nutrient uptake. Maintenance of grassed swales involves regular mowing, re-seeding, and weed control, along with inspections to check for erosion and ensure the integrity of the vegetative cover. To function properly, the inflow to the swale must be sheet flow from a filter strip or an impervious surface (i.e., not from the end of a pipe). Swales have demonstrated solids removals exceeding 80 percent. Apart from grassed swales, **grassed waterways** (wide, shallow channels lined with sod) are often used as outlets for runoff from terraces.

**Buffer strips** are combinations of trees, shrubs, and grasses planted parallel to a stream. Buffer strips should consist of three zones—about four or five rows of trees closest to the stream, one or two rows of shrubs, and a 20 to 24 foot wide grass zone on the outer edge. They decrease the velocity of runoff, thus moderating flooding and preventing stream bank erosion. The vegetation and soils also strain and filter sediments and chemicals. Buffer strips should be maintained by controlling weeds and mowing grasses once or twice annually. In the long term, each zone should be harvested and replanted. About 10 to 20 percent removal of solids has been demonstrated in buffer zones. These buffer strips, however, do not necessarily increase infiltration.

**Filter strips** are areas of close-growing vegetation on gently sloped land surfaces bordering a surface water body. They work by holding soils in place, allowing some infiltration, and filtering solid particles out of the runoff from small storms. Plants with dense root systems are preferred; the ideal species and mixes of vegetation are specific to the region. The width and length of the filter strip depends on the size and grade of the slope it drains. Maintenance activities include inspections, mowing, and removal of sediment build-up. Filter strips can remove nitrogen and phosphorus, but are less effective in filtering pesticides. They are most effective when water flow is even and shallow and if grass can regrow between rains.

**Storm water ponds** (wet ponds) consist of a permanent pond, where solids settle during and between storms, and a zone of emergent wetland vegetation where dissolved contaminants are removed through biochemical processes. Wet ponds are usually developed as water features in a community, increasing the value of adjacent property. Other than landscape maintenance, only annual inspection of the outlets and shoreline is required. Vegetation should be harvested every 3 to 5 years, and sediment removed every 7 to 10 years. Wet ponds can achieve 40 to 60 percent phosphorus removal and 30 to 40 percent total nitrogen removal.

**Constructed wetlands** are similar to wet ponds, with more emergent aquatic vegetation and a smaller open water area. Storm water wetlands are different from natural wetlands in that they are designed to treat storm water runoff, and typically have less biodiversity than natural wetlands. A wetland should have a settling pond, or forebay, if significant upstream soil erosion
is anticipated. Coarse particles remain trapped in the forebay, and maintenance is performed on this smaller pool. Wetlands remove the same pollutants as wet ponds through settling of solids and biochemical processes, with about the same efficiency. Maintenance requirements for wetlands are similar to those of wet ponds.

**Infiltration practices (basins and trenches)** are long, narrow stone-filled excavated trenches, 3 to 12 feet deep. Runoff is stored in the basin or in voids between the stones in a trench and slowly infiltrates into the soil matrix below, where filtering removes pollutants. Infiltration devices alone do not remove contaminants, and should be combined with a pretreatment practice such as a swale or sediment basin to prevent premature clogging. Maintenance consists of inspections annually and after major rain storms and debris removal, especially in inlets and overflow channels. Infiltration devices and associated practices can achieve up to 70 to 98 percent contaminant removal.

**Swirl-type concentrators** are underground vaults designed to create a circular motion to encourage sedimentation and oil and grease removal. The currents rapidly separate out settleable grit and floatable matter, which are concentrated for treatment, while the cleaner, treated flow discharges to receiving waters. Swirl concentrators have demonstrated total suspended solids and BOD removal efficiencies exceeding 60 percent.

**BMPs for Class V storm water drainage wells** address siting, design, and operation of these wells. Siting BMPs for storm water drainage wells include minimum setbacks from surface waters, drinking water wells, or the water table. Storm water drainage wells may also be prohibited from areas of critical concern, such as source water protection areas, or from areas where the engineering properties of the soil are not ideal for their performance. Available design BMPs for storm water drainage wells include sediment removal devices (such as oil/grit separators or filter strips), oil and grease separators, and pretreatment devices such as infiltration trenches or wetlands (described above). Maintenance of these BMPs is crucial to their proper operation. Management measures related to operation include spill response, monitoring, and maintenance procedures. Source separation, or keeping runoff from industrial areas away from storm water drainage wells, involves using containment devices such as berms or curbs (see the fact sheets on vehicle washing and small quantity chemical use for more information on these devices).

**EPA’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitting Program** regulates storm water runoff from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) and industrial activity (including construction). The current rules establish permit requirements for more than 5,000 MS4s nationwide. NPDES storm water permits issued to MS4s require these MS4s to develop the necessary legal authority to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water to the maximum extent practicable and to develop and implement a storm water management program that includes:

- Structural and source control measures to reduce pollutants from runoff from commercial and residential areas, including maintenance, monitoring, and planning activities;
- Detection and removal of illicit discharges and improper disposal into the storm sewer;
- Monitoring and control of storm water discharges from certain industrial activities; and
- Construction site storm water control.
In addition, the storm water rule for certain small MS4s requires post-construction storm water management controls. These local controls are in addition to existing federal regulations that require NPDES permits of all construction activities disturbing greater than one acre.

Recently, EPA developed a menu of BMPs that provides more than 100 fact sheets on measures that small MS4s could use to control urban storm water runoff. The menu is available from EPA’s Web site at www.epa.gov/npdes.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

These sources contain information on storm water management measures. All of the documents listed are available for free on the Internet. State departments of transportation or agriculture, whose contact information can be found on the Internet or in the phone book, are also good sources of information.

To pass local ordinances or regulations to affect storm water controls, contact city or county public works departments, zoning offices, permitting offices, or transportation departments, who typically have the authority to pass local ordinances. Contact local government authorities in your area to see if there are ordinances in place to manage storm water. Numerous examples of local source water protection-related ordinances for various potential contaminant sources can be found at http://www.epa.gov/r5water/ordcom/, http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/ordinance/, and http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/ordinance/links.htm.

The following resources provide information on selection and design of specific management measures:

The Center for Watershed Protection’s Stormwater Manager's Resource Center (www.stormwatercenter.net) provides technical assistance storm water management issues.

Northern Arizona University offers a course on wet weather flow management, materials are available at http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~dmh3/egr499/.


University extension services are excellent sources for information on water quality issues, including storm water management. The Oregon Department of Agriculture offers comprehensive list of links to many of these on its Web site (http://www.oda.state.or.us/Natural_Resources/wq_ces.htm).

Following are examples of extension services that offer fact sheets on a variety of storm water management measures, including best management practices:

   Iowa State University Extension (http://www.extension.iastate.edu/Pages/pubs/).

   North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service (http://www.ces.ncsu.edu/resources/).

   Oklahoma State University. Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (http://agweb.okstate.edu/pearl/wqs).

   Purdue University Cooperative Extension Service (http://www.agcom.purdue.edu/AgCom/Pubs/menu.htm).
## Zone-specific Native and Polynesian plants for Maui County

### Zone 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Spread</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Water req.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Psilotum nudum</td>
<td>moa, moa kula</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Colubrina asiatica</td>
<td>'anapanapa</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Eragrostis monticola</td>
<td>kalamalo</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Eragrostis variabilis</td>
<td>'emo-loa</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Fimbristylos cymosa ssp. spathacea</td>
<td>mau'u'akai 'aki fimbristylis</td>
<td>0.5'</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Boerhavia repens</td>
<td>alena</td>
<td>0.5'</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Chamaesyce celastroides var. laehiensis</td>
<td>'akoko</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Cressa truxillensis</td>
<td>cressa</td>
<td>0.5'</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Heliotropium anomalum var. argenteum</td>
<td>hinahina ku kakahai</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Ipomoea tuboides</td>
<td>Hawaiian moon flower, 'uala</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Jacquemontia ovalifolia ssp. sandwicensis</td>
<td>pa'u o h'ilaka</td>
<td>0.5'</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Lipochaeta integrifolia</td>
<td>nehe</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Peperomia leptostachya</td>
<td>'ala'ala-wai-nui</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Plumbago zeylanica</td>
<td>'ilie'e</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Sesuvium portulacastrum</td>
<td>'akulikuli, sea-purslane</td>
<td>0.5'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Sida fallax</td>
<td>'ilima</td>
<td>0.5'</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Tephrosia purpurea var. purpurea</td>
<td>'auhuhu</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr - Sh</td>
<td>Hibiscus calyphyllus</td>
<td>ma'o hau hele, Rock's hibiscus</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr - Sh</td>
<td>Lipochaeta rockii</td>
<td>nehe</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr - Sh</td>
<td>Lipochaeta succulenta</td>
<td>nehe</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr - Sh</td>
<td>Lycium sandwicense</td>
<td>'ohelo-kai, 'ae'ae</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Cocos nucifera</td>
<td>coconut, niu</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pritchardia hillebrandii</td>
<td>lo'ulu, fan palm</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mariscus javanicus</td>
<td>marsh cypress, 'ahu'awa</td>
<td>0.5'</td>
<td>0.5'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Spread</td>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>Water req.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Argemone glauca var. deciplens</td>
<td>pua kala</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Bidens mauliensis</td>
<td>ko'oko'olau</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Bidens menziesii ssp. menziesii</td>
<td>ko'oko'olau</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Bidens micrantha ssp. micrantha</td>
<td>ko'oko'olau</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Chenopodium oahuense</td>
<td>'ahahe'a, 'aweoweo</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td></td>
<td>sea to higher</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Dianella sandwicensis</td>
<td>'uki</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>1,000' to higher</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Gossypium tomentosum</td>
<td>mao, Hawaiian cotton</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Hedyotis spp.</td>
<td>au, pilo</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>1,000' to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Lipochaeta lavarum</td>
<td>nehe</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Osteomeles anthyllidifolia</td>
<td>'ulei, eluahe</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Scaevola sericea</td>
<td>naupaka, naupaka-kahakai</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Senna gaudichaudii</td>
<td>kolomana</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Solanum nelsonii</td>
<td>'akia, beach solanum</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Styphelia tariataeiae</td>
<td>pukiawe</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>1,000' to higher</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Vitex rotundifolia</td>
<td>pohonahina</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Wikstroemia uva-ursi kauaiensis kauaiensis</td>
<td>akia, Molokai osmanthus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh-Tr</td>
<td>Broussonetia papyrifera</td>
<td>wauke, paper mulberry</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh-Tr</td>
<td>Myoporum sandwicensc</td>
<td>naio, false sandalwood</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>sea to higher</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh-Tr</td>
<td>Nototrichium sandwicensc</td>
<td>kulu'i</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh-Tr</td>
<td>Dodonaea viscosa</td>
<td>'a'alli</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>sea to higher</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Aleurites moluccana</td>
<td>candlenut, kukui</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Medium to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Calophyllum inophyllum</td>
<td>kamani, alexandrian laurel</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Medium to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Canthium odoratum</td>
<td>Ahahe'e, 'ohe'e, walahe'e</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Cordia subcordata</td>
<td>kou</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Diospyros sandwicensis</td>
<td>lama</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Erythrina sandwicensis</td>
<td>williwi</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Metrosideros polymorpha var. macrophylla</td>
<td>poki'a lehua</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Wet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Zone-specific Native and Polynesian plants for Maui County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Spread</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Water req.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Morinda citrifolia</td>
<td>Indian mulberry, noni</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Nesoloma polynesium</td>
<td>keahi</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Nestegis sandwicensis</td>
<td>olopa</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>1,000' to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Pandanus tectorius</td>
<td>hala, puhala (HALELIST)</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>sea to 1,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Pleomele auwahiensis</td>
<td>halaapepe</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Rauvolfia sandwicensis</td>
<td>hao</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Reynoldsia sandwicensis</td>
<td>'ohe makai</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>1,000' to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Santalum ellipticum</td>
<td>coastal sandalwood, 'ill-ahi</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Thespesia populnea</td>
<td>milo</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>sea to 3,000'</td>
<td>Dry to Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/2008</td>
<td>Cash Receipt</td>
<td>CK</td>
<td>-1504.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/14/2008</td>
<td>Billing</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>1697.88</td>
<td>1697.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/22/2008</td>
<td>Cash Receipt</td>
<td>CK</td>
<td>-1697.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2008</td>
<td>Billing</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>1756.05</td>
<td>1756.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/2008</td>
<td>Cash Receipt</td>
<td>CK</td>
<td>-1756.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/2008</td>
<td>Billing</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>1684.95</td>
<td>1684.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prem Id</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Mtr Num</td>
<td>Rdg Date</td>
<td>High Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>12/15/08</td>
<td>1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>10/15/08</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>08/14/08</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>06/17/08</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>04/16/08</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>02/15/08</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>12/18/07</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>10/17/07</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>09/11/07</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>09/11/07</td>
<td>8734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>08/16/07</td>
<td>8662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>06/18/07</td>
<td>8488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025998</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>97589738</td>
<td>04/18/07</td>
<td>8210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prem ID: 1025998  Type of Serv: ___  Mtr Seq:  _  Date: 12 29 2008  Time: 11 59PM
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12:11 PM

**Action (C,D,N)........................ Mtr Num: 97589738**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cur Stat</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cur Stat Date</td>
<td>09 30 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc Code</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc Code Date</td>
<td>09 30 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Date</td>
<td>08 11 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Num</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Price</td>
<td>149.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fin Control Num</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR Num</td>
<td>04785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prem ID</td>
<td>1025998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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February 11, 2009

Jeffrey K. Eng, Director
County of Maui
Department of Water Supply
200 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

SUBJECT: Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Eng:

Thank you for your letter dated December 31, 2008, providing comments on the early consultation request for the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., the following comments are offered in response to your remarks:

1. The existing 1 ½ - inch water meter is a standard size meter for McDonald’s; therefore, a larger meter will not be required. With regard to water consumption, existing domestic and irrigation demands will be maintained with the proposed action.

2. The project engineer recognizes that there is an existing fire hydrant on Papalaua Street, which fronts the project site near its makai boundary. Fire flow calculations will be done during the building permit process to verify that onsite fire protection will not be required. In addition, an existing reduced pressure back-flow preventer will be reused.

3. You have the applicant’s assurances that preliminary landscaping plans for the subject project incorporate native plants to the extent practicable. Meanwhile, the new restaurant will incorporate low-flow water fixtures and devices in each restroom, a standard practice in McDonald’s restaurants.

4. The project engineer has produced a drainage letter report which addresses storm water runoff as a result of the proposed action. The drainage letter report concludes that due to an increase in landscaped area, storm runoff will be reduced by 0.07 cfs, from 1.93 cfs to 1.86 cfs. It is noted that this letter report will be
incorporated into the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). Furthermore, during construction, Best Management Practices (BMPs) for grading and erosion control will be implemented to prevent infiltration and runoff.

Your input on the proposed action is greatly appreciated. A copy of the Draft EA will be provided to your office for review and comment.

Should you require additional information, or should any questions arise in regards to the subject project, please feel free to contact me at (808) 244-2015 or email kim@mhplanning.com.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawai'i, Inc.
   Conrad Shiroma, Kim & Shiroma Engineers, Inc.
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December 19, 2008

Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High St. Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog,

Subject: Early Consultation Request for Proposed Reconstruction of McDonald's Restaurants of Hawai'i, Inc., Lahaina Restaurant
Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii
TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019

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

In reviewing our records and the information received, Maui Electric Company (MECO) has no objections to the subject project at this time. If the customer plans to add any additional electrical load to our system, we highly encourage the customer to submit an electrical service request so that any service upgrade can be provided on a timely basis.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please call me at 871-2340.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Ray Okazaki
Staff Engineer
January 22, 2009

Ray Okazaki
Maui Electric Company, Ltd.
210 West Kamehameha Avenue
Post Office Box 398
Kahului, Hawai‘i 96733-6898

SUBJECT: Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Okazaki:

On behalf of the applicant, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we thank you for your letter dated December 19, 2008, providing comments on the early consultation request for the subject project.

The applicant acknowledges the determination made by your office that there are no objections to the subject project at this time. The applicant does not plan to add any additional electrical load to your system, however, should any additional electrical load be required, a request for an electrical service upgrade will be submitted to your office.

Your input on the proposed action is greatly appreciated. A copy of the Draft EA will be provided to your office for review and comment. Should you require additional information, or should any questions arise in regards to the subject project, please feel free to contact me at (808) 244-2015 or email kim@mhplanning.com.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
    Conrad Shiroma, Kim & Shiroma Engineers, Inc.
December 23, 2008

Ms. Kimberly Skog  
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.  
Attention: Kimberly Skog, Planner  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Re: Proposed reconstruction of McDonald’s Restaurant in Lahaina

Dear Ms. Skog,

Thank you for requesting our comments on the Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant demolition and reconstruction.

We are concerned that the reconstruction will be done to “provide required facility upgrades which will meet current corporate branding standards” yet there is no mention of the need to conform to the historic integrity of Lahaina Town.

This is a highly visible location on one of the major roadways leading into Lahaina from the highway. It is of utmost importance that this proposed new building “fit” into the important historical and cultural landscape of this area.

We look forward to your reply.

[Signature]

Ms. Theo Morrison  
Executive Director  
Lahaina Restoration Foundation

PS: I have replaced Keoki Freeland as Executive Director
Theo Morrison, Executive Director  
Lahaina Restoration Foundation  
120 Dickenson Street  
Lahaina, Hawai‘i 96761  

SUBJECT: Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at  
TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i

Dear Ms. Morrison:

Thank you for your letter dated December 23, 2008 providing comments on the early consultation request for the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawai‘i, Inc., the following comments are offered in response to your remarks:

McDonald’s has anticipated the need for an exterior design for their proposed replacement facility that responds to Lahaina’s unique architectural heritage. To this end, they have retained Jim Niess of Maui Architectural Group to assist in this effort. This firm has a sound reputation for plantation era vernacular design. They will be utilizing the Architectural Style Book for Lahaina, along with an inventory of historic Lahaina commercial buildings, as a guideline to create a facade that is compatible with structures in the Historic District, even though this property is not located within the District. Mr. Neiss has been informed of your interest in the project and will solicit your input and review as the design develops.
Your comments on the proposed action are greatly appreciated. A copy of the Draft EA will be provided to your office for review and comment. Should you require additional information, or should any questions arise in regards to the subject project, please feel free to contact me at (808) 244-2015 or email kim@mhplanning.com.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:tn
cc: Kelley Nakano, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawai'i, Inc.
    Jim Niess, Maui Architectural Group, Inc.
X. AGENCIES CONSULTED DURING THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD; LETTERS RECEIVED; AND RESPONSES TO SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS
X. AGENCIES CONSULTED DURING THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD; LETTERS RECEIVED; AND RESPONSES TO SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS

A notice of the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) was filed and published in the Office of Environmental Quality Control's The Environmental Notice on June 23, 2009.

The following agencies were also sent a copy of the Draft EA for review and comment. The comments received, as well as responses to substantive comments, are included in this chapter.

FEDERAL AGENCIES

1. Larry Yamamoto, State Conservationist
   U.S. Department of Agriculture
   Natural Resources Conservation Service
   P.O. Box 50004
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96850-0001

2. Ranae Ganske-Cerizo, Soil Conservationist
   Natural Resources Conservation Service
   U.S. Department of Agriculture
   77 Hokele Street, Suite 202
   Kahului, Hawai‘i 96732

3. George Young
   Chief, Regulatory Branch
   U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu
   Regulatory Branch
   Building 230
   Fort Shafter, Hawai‘i 96858-5440

4. Wayne Nastri, Regional Administrator
   U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
   Region 9
   75 Hawthorne Street
   San Francisco, California 94105

5. Gordon Furutani, Field Office Director
   U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
   500 Ala Moana Boulevard, Suite 3A
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813-4918

6. Patrick Leonard
   Field Supervisor
   U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
   300 Ala Moana Blvd., Rm. 3-122
   Box 50088
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

7. Russ K. Saito, State Comptroller
   Department of Accounting and General Services
   1151 Punchbowl Street, #426
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

8. Sandra Lee Kunimoto, Chair
   Department of Agriculture
   1428 South King Street
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96814-2512

9. Georgina K. Kawamura, Director
   Department of Budget and Finance
   P. O. Box 150
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96810
10. Karen Seddon  
Executive Director  
Hawai‘i Housing Finance and Development Corporation  
677 Queen Street  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

11. Theodore E. Liu, Director  
State of Hawai‘i  
Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism  
P.O. Box 2359  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96804

12. Heidi Meeker  
Planning Division  
Office of Business Services  
Department of Education  
c/o Kalani High School  
4680 Kalanianaole Highway, #T-B1A  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96821

cc: Lindsay Ball, Complex Area Superintendent (Lanai/Moloka‘i/Hana/Lahaina)

13. Micah Kane, Chairman  
Department of Hawaiian Home Lands  
P.O. Box 1879  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96805

14. Chiyoue Fukino, M.D., Director  
State of Hawai‘i  
Department of Health  
919 Ala Moana Blvd., Room 300  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96814

15. Alec Wong, P.E., Chief  
Clean Water Branch  
State of Hawai‘i  
Department of Health  
919 Ala Moana Blvd., Room 300  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96814

16. Patti Kitowski, Acting District Environmental Health Program Chief  
State of Hawai‘i  
Department of Health  
54 High Street  
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

17. Laura Thielen, Chairperson  
State of Hawai‘i  
Department of Land and Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 621  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96809

18. Dr. Puaalaokalani Aiu, Administrator  
State of Hawai‘i  
Department of Land and Natural Resources  
State Historic Preservation Division  
601 Kamokila Blvd., Room 555  
Kapolei, Hawai‘i 96707

19. Hinano Rodrigues  
Mau‘i/Lanai Islands Burial Council  
130 Mahalani Street  
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

20. Brennon Morioka, Director  
State of Hawai‘i  
Department of Transportation  
869 Punchbowl Street  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

cc: Fred Cajigal

21. Major General Robert G.S. Lee, Director  
Hawai‘i State Civil Defense  
3949 Diamond Head Road  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96816-4495

22. Katherine Kealoha, Director  
Office Of Environmental Quality Control  
235 S. Beretania Street, Suite 702  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

23. Clyde Namu'o, Administrator  
Office of Hawaiian Affairs  
711 Kapiolani Boulevard, Suite 500  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

24. Abbey Seth Mayer, Director  
State of Hawai‘i  
Office of Planning  
P.O. Box 2359  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96804
25. Dan Davidson, Executive Officer  
   State of Hawai‘i  
   State Land Use Commission  
   P.O. Box 2359  
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96804

33. Tamara Horcajo, Director  
   County of Maui  
   Department of Parks and Recreation  
   700 Halia Nakoa Street, Unit 2  
   Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

26. Rosalyn H. Baker, Senator  
   Hawai‘i State Senate  
   Hawai‘i State Capitol, Room 210  
   415 S. Beretania Street  
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

34. Jeffrey Hunt, Director  
   County of Maui  
   Department of Planning  
   250 South High Street  
   Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

27. Angus L.K. McKelvey, Representative  
   House of Representatives  
   Hawai‘i State Capitol, Room 315  
   415 S. Beretania Street  
   Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

35. Gary Yabuta, Chief  
   County of Maui Police Department  
   55 Mahalani Street  
   Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

28. Charmaine Tavares, Mayor  
   County of Maui  
   200 South High Street  
   Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

36. Milton Arakawa, Director  
   County of Maui Department of Public Works  
   200 South High Street  
   Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

29. Deirdre Tegarden, Coordinator  
   County of Maui Office of Economic Development  
   2200 Main Street, Suite 305  
   Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

37. Cheryl Okuma, Director  
   County of Maui Department of Environmental Management  
   One Main Plaza  
   2200 Main Street, Suite 175  
   Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

30. Gen Linuma, Administrator  
    Maui Civil Defense Agency  
    200 South High Street  
    Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

38. Donald Medeiros, Director  
    County of Maui Department of Transportation  
    200 South High Street  
    Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

31. Jeffrey A. Murray, Fire Chief  
    County of Maui Department of Fire and Public Safety  
    200 Dairy Road  
    Kahului, Hawai‘i 96732

39. Jeffrey Eng, Director  
    County of Maui Department of Water Supply  
    200 South High Street  
    Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

32. Lori Tsuhako, Director  
    County of Maui Department of Housing and Human Concerns  
    One Main Plaza  
    2200 Main Street, Suite 546  
    Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

40. Councilmember Jo Anne Johnson  
    Maui County Council  
    200 South High Street  
    Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

41. Hawaiian Telcom  
    60 South Church Street  
    Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793
42. Greg Kauhi, Manager, Customer Operations
Maui Electric Company, Ltd.
P.O. Box 398
Kahului, Hawai'i 96733

43. Leilani Puliano, Executive Director
Lahaina Bypass Now
505 Front Street, Suite 202
Lahaina, Hawai'i 96761

44. Theo Morrison, Executive Director
Lahaina Restoration Foundation
120 Dickenson Street
Lahaina, Hawai'i 96761

45. Karee Karlucci, Executive Director
Lahaina Town Action Committee
648 Wharf Street, Suite 102
Lahaina, Hawai'i 96761

46. Pamela Tumpap, Executive Director
Maui Chamber of Commerce
313 Ano Street
Kahului, Hawai'i 96732

47. Joe Pluta, President
West Maui Improvement Foundation
P. O. Box 10338
Lahaina, Hawai'i 96761

48. Zeke Kalua, Executive Director
West Maui Taxpayers Association
P.O. Box 10338
Lahaina, Hawai'i 96761
Regulatory Branch

Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96739

July 7, 2009

File Number POH-2009-00220

Dear Ms. Skog:

This letter is in response to your request, dated June 19, 2009 for our review and comment of the Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction located at 885 Wainee St. Lahaina, Hawai‘i (TMK 245001019).

Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) of 1899 requires that a Department of the Army (DA) permit be obtained from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) prior to undertaking any construction, dredging, and other activities occurring in, over, or under navigable waters of the United States (U.S.) (e.g., the Pacific Ocean). Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1344) requires that a DA permit be obtained for the discharge (placement) of dredge and/ or fill material into waters of the U.S. Waters of the U.S. include both navigable waters of the U.S., referred to also as the traditional navigable waters (TNW), wetlands adjacent to TNWs, non-navigable tributaries that have perennial flow or continuous seasonal flow, and wetlands directly abutting such tributaries.

After careful review of the information furnished to our office in conjunction with available information, it appears that the subject parcel consist entirely of uplands, and the proposed project will not involve any activities occurring within navigable waters of the U.S. or the discharge (placement) of dredged and/ or fill material into jurisdictional waters of the U.S.; therefore, a DA permit will not be required. This determination does not relieve you of any responsibility to obtain any other permits, licenses, or approvals that may be required under County, State, or Federal law for your proposed work.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please Ms. Meris Bantilan-Smith, of my Regulatory staff at 808-438-7023 (FAX: 808-438-4060) or by electronic mail at Meris.Bantilan-Smith@usace.army.mil. Please include file number POH-2009-220 in any future correspondence regarding this project. Please be advised you can provide comments on your experience with the Corps’ Honolulu District Regulatory Branch by accessing our web-based customer survey form at http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html.

Sincerely,

George P. Young, P.E.
Chief, Regulatory Branch
Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2)4-5-001:019
Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii
(SMA1 2009/0008) (EA 2009/004)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction.

This proposed project does not impact any of the Department of Accounting and General Services’ projects or existing facilities, and we have no comments to offer.

If you have any questions, please call me at 586-0400 or have your staff call Mr. Clarence Kubo of the Public Works Division at 586-0488.

Sincerely,

RUSS K. SAITO
State Comptroller

cc: Mr. Kurt Wollenhaupt, County of Maui Department of Planning
Ref. No. P-12672

Ms. Kimberly Skog  
Planner  
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction  
TMK: (2)4-5-001:019  
Lahaina, Maui

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment upon the Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction. The Office of Planning has no comments at this time. In so stating, the Office offers no judgment of either the adequacy of the document itself or the merits of the proposed project.

If you have any questions, please contact our Land Use Division at 587-2842.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Abbey Seth Mayer  
Director
July 7, 2009

Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2)4-5-001:019

The Department of Education has reviewed the Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction. The DOE has no comment.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please contact Jeremy Kwock of the Facilities Development Branch at (808) 377-8301.

Sincerely yours,

Duane Y. Kashiwai
Public Works Administrator
Facilities Development Branch

DYK.jmb

c: Kurt Wollenhaupt, Staff Planner, Department of Planning
   Lindsay Ball, CAS, Hana/Lahaina/Lanai/Molokai Complex Areas
July 6, 2009

Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK(2)4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i (SM1 2009/0008) (EA 2009/0004)

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject proposal. The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands has no comment to offer at this time. If you have any questions, please contact our Planning Office at (808) 620-9480.

Aloha and mahalo,

[Signature]
Micah A. Kane, Chairman
Hawaiian Homes Commission
Ms. Kimberly Skog  
Planner  
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, Hawaii  96793

Dear Ms. Skog: 

Subject: No Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction Lahaina, Island of Maui, Hawaii  
TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019

The Department of Health (DOH), Clean Water Branch (CWB), has reviewed the subject document and has no comments at this time. The DOH-CWB provided early consultation comments on this project (DOH-CWB Letter No. 12111PDCL.08, dated December 22, 2008).

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

Sincerely, 

Alec Wong, P.E., CHIEF  
Clean Water Branch

DCL:ml

c: Environmental Planning Office, Reference No. EPO 09-099 [via e-mail only]  
Mr. Kurt Wollenhaupt, County of Maui [via email kurt.wollenhaupt@mauicounty.gov only]
Ms. Kimberly Skog
Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction
TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i
SM 2009/0008 & EA 2009/0004

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to review and comment on this project. The following comments are offered:

The noise created during the construction phase of the project may exceed the maximum allowable levels as set forth in Hawaii Administrative Rules, Chapter 11-46 “Community Noise Control”. A noise permit may be required and should be obtained before the commencement of this project.

It is strongly recommended that the Standard Comments found at the Department’s website: http://hawaii.gov/health/environmental/env-planning/landuse/landuse.html be reviewed, and any comments specifically applicable to this project should be adhered to.

Should you have any questions, please call me at 808 984-8230 or e-mail me at patricia.kitkowski@doh.hawaii.gov.

Sincerely,

Patti Kitkowski
Acting District Environmental Health Program Chief

Kurt F. Wollenhaupt, Planning Dept.
OEQC
August 20, 2009

Patti Kitkowski  
Acting District Environmental  
Health Program Chief  
Department of Health  
State of Hawai‘i  
54 High Street  
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction; TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i (SM1 2009/0008 and EA 2009/0004)

Dear Ms. Kitkowski:

Thank you for your letter dated July 2, 2009, providing comments on the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we wish to provide the following information in response to your comments.

Prior to the commencement of construction, the applicant will review the maximum allowable levels for construction noise set forth by Chapter 11-46, Hawaii Administrative Rules, “Community Noise Control”, and if required, a noise permit will be obtained. In addition, as requested, your Department’s standard comments will be reviewed, and the applicant confirms that comments specifically applicable to the proposed project will be adhered to.
Thank you for your comments. Should you have any questions regarding the subject project, please feel free to call me at (808)244-2015.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
    Kurt Wollenhaupt, Department of Planning
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Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

SUBJECT: Reconstruction of McDonald’s Restaurant - Lahaina
        Early Consultation Request
        (TMK No.: 2nd, 4-5-001:019)

The Department of Health (DOH), Office of Solid Waste Management has reviewed the subject project in response to this early consultation request. The project involves demolition of the existing 4,274-square foot Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant with subsequent reconstruction of a 4,365-square foot McDonald’s Restaurant. Based on our review of the Draft Environmental Assessment, we have the following comments related to the proposed construction and demolition activities:

1. The generator of the waste must determine if any demolition building components contain hazardous waste. Please refer to Attachment 1.

2. Any nonhazardous building components that contain lead-based paint must be disposed of at DOH-permitted disposal facilities and not recycled. Please refer to Attachment 2.

3. Please make arrangements with DOH-permitted facilities like Pohakulepo Recycling, LLC for the potential disposition of that unpainted, uncontaminated concrete (please note that no asbestos, lead-based paint or other types of contamination will be accepted) from demolition or new construction. Concrete or other wastes that fail the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure test for hazardous waste must be managed as hazardous waste.
4. Nonhazardous concrete with lead-based paint must, prior to demolition, be separated from concrete intended for recycling and sent to DOH-permitted disposal facilities. The applicant needs to notify either Mr. Jose Ruiz or Ms. Rogette Bernardino of our Solid and Hazardous Waste Branch at (808) 586-4226 as to when the demolition and/or abatement activities will occur.

5. If on-site reuse of concrete is intended, then the uncontaminated concrete must also meet the State's definition of "inert fill material" defined as:

Section 342H-1, HRS Definition
"Inert fill material" means earth, soil, rocks, rock-like material such as cured asphalt, brick, and clean concrete less than eight inches in diameter, except as specified by a licensed soils engineer with no exposed steel reinforcing rod. The fill material shall not contain vegetation or organic material, or other solid waste.

6. All waste gypsum board and plaster, resulting from demolition and/or new construction must be disposed of properly. Currently, no recycling facility in Hawaii is permitted to accept waste gypsum board from demolition projects.

7. We assume that any wood waste from demolition or new construction stages is of the treated variety. Such wood waste must be disposed of at DOH-permitted disposal facilities, not recycled.

8. Dispose of non-reusable glass at DOH-permitted disposal facilities. We encourage the reuse of glass, if in a reusable form. Permitted glass recyclers on Maui presently only accept glass bottles for recycling.

9. Please send any waste appliances or "white goods" that do not contain refrigeration units to scrap metal recyclers like SOS Metals, which also removes fluids/freon from white goods with refrigeration units.

10. Please send greenwaste to permitted composting facilities such as Maui EKO Systems. Whenever feasible, we also encourage on-site reuse of any trees planned for removal.

Please be reminded that the applicant's submittal was reviewed with respect to solid and hazardous waste management and disposal issues only. We also recommend that the applicant obtain approval from other agencies (such as OSHA) that may be involved in the oversight and implementation of various aspects of their proposed action.
Ms. Kimberly Skog  
July 28, 2009  
Page 3

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Mr. John Valera of our Office of Solid Waste Management at (808) 586-4226.

Sincerely,

STEVEN Y.K. CHANG, P.E., CHIEF  
Solid and Hazardous Waste Branch

Enclosures:  
Attachment 1  Hawaii Department of Health - Construction and Demolition Waste Disposal General Guidance  
Attachment 2  Disposal of Lead-Based Paint Waste
This C&D waste disposal guidance supersedes the previous letter dated January 31, 1996 and is intended to give a general guidance and clarify hazardous waste determination of C&D waste and its proper disposal. The general inquiries are for construction and demolition waste that contain lead paint. C&D waste includes a building determined by the generator to be demolished and therefore a waste.

Hazardous Waste Determination

According to the Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) 11-262.11, the generator of a solid waste must determine if that waste is a hazardous waste. HAR 11-262.11 (c)(1)(2) states that either the waste can be tested according to the methods set forth in subchapter C of chapter 11-261 or by applying knowledge of the hazard characteristic of the waste in light of the material, respectively. If the waste is determined to be hazardous, the generator must refer to HAR 11-262, 11-264, 11-265, 11-268 for the proper management, possible exclusions or restrictions pertaining to the that waste. Non-hazardous C&D waste may be transported to an approved solid waste landfill and the landfill operator be provided with documentation confirming the waste determination.

Applying Knowledge

The application of knowledge of the waste may be used if the characteristics of that waste can be determined. For instance, material safety data sheets (MSDS), and/or prior knowledge of similar waste may be applied.

Testing

Another hazardous waste determination involves testing the C&D waste.

**Preliminary sampling** of part of the C&D waste like the waste paint (paint-chips) can be utilized. Preliminary sampling, as oppose to a representative sample may include a sample of the paint-waste to determine if it contains lead and its quantity. During this preliminary sampling a "Total method" or Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Protocol (TCLP) approach may be utilized. If a total analysis of the waste demonstrates that individual analytes (i.e. lead) are not present in the waste, or that they are present but at such low concentrations that the appropriate regulatory level (i.e. 5 ppm TCLP lead) could not possibly be exceeded, then the TCLP need not be conducted and the C&D waste shall be considered non-hazardous. However, if the Total method is not conclusive and may indicate the exceedance of 5 ppm TCLP, then a TCLP test method is recommended to determine the lead level of the paint-waste sample. Also, the generator may opt to forgo the preliminary sampling and proceed to a representative sampling of the entire C&D waste.

**Representative samples** should be taken from the entire C&D waste. Samples should include core samples of the C&D waste which include the waste paint. Generally, core samples should be obtained from the basic major elements of the C&D waste (i.e. walls, roofing, other fixtures and interior contents). Each generator would be responsible for their own sampling plan to meet their waste determination using the aforementioned testing criteria. We advise working with experience environmental companies and labs for guidance and implementation. Also, where applicable, the DOH hazardous waste program an be contacted. The total method or TCLP may be selected as a testing criteria subject to the same above conditions.

May 24, 1996 pk
Using both testing and knowledge for hazardous waste determination

A combination of testing and applying knowledge could be utilized too. For instance, a paint chip can be analyzed for lead and the concentration of lead could be calculated with the amount or mass of the entire waste debris to determined the ratio of lead to the mass or parts per million (ppm.)

Other options:

Another option is to segregate the structure with the lead paint (i.e. door, window frame) from the non-hazardous debris and dispose of the structure with lead paint (> 5 ppm) as a hazardous waste. The remaining non-hazardous debris may be sent to a local landfill accepting construction debris.

Any questions, please contact the Hawaii Department of Health Solid and Waste Branch, Hazardous Waste Program at (808) 586-4226.
STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
P.O. Box 3378
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96801-3378

January 16, 2003

S0114JV

POLICY NOTICE
Guidance Document
for the Disposal of Lead-Based Paint Wastes

Clarification of Recommended
Lead-Based Paint Handling and Disposal Procedures

TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES:

The Hawai‘i Department of Health, Solid and Hazardous Waste Branch is issuing a policy statement entitled, Disposal of Lead-Based Paint Waste, effective January 1, 2003. A copy is attached.

The Disposal of Lead-Based Paint Wastes policy is intended to help contractors properly dispose of lead-based paint (LBP) wastes. Disposal is the preferred option in most cases. Recycling is allowed for the concrete portion of LBP concrete, provided the LBP is completely abated. However, treated wood with LBP, even if abated, cannot be recycled into mulch, fill, or ground cover applications. This policy also sets LBP waste disposal procedures for generators of LBP waste from residential dwellings, and generators of LBP waste from demolition projects and non-residential structures. Homeowners who generate their own LBP wastes may continue to dispose such wastes with their household refuse provided that the waste is not resulting from demolition work.

Please bring this policy to the attention of anyone you know who may have an interest in this matter. Should you have any questions regarding this policy, please contact the Solid Waste Section of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Branch at (808) 586-4226.

Sincerely,

STEVEN Y. K. CHANG, P.E., MANAGER
Solid and Hazardous Waste Branch

Attachment
STATE OF HAWAI‘I
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE BRANCH
OFFICE OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

DISPOSAL OF LEAD-BASED PAINT WASTE
Eff. January 1, 2003

This guidance document clarifies existing federal, state and local requirements for the management and disposal of lead-based paint waste, and their impacts on the activities of contractors and other generators of lead-based paint debris. LBP waste is generated from either the abatement, rehabilitation, renovation, remodeling or demolition of non-residential buildings and residential dwellings constructed prior to 1978.

Based on current Federal policy statements and State regulations (see Addendum):

1. Generators of non-residential LBP waste shall conduct a **hazardous waste determination** according to HAR Chapter 11-261. The TCLP (Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure) is the test method for determining whether a “solid waste” exhibits the toxicity characteristics of “hazardous waste.” Contact the Hazardous Waste Program (808) 586-4226 for a copy of the procedures.

2. Generators of residential demolition LBP waste shall also conduct a **hazardous waste determination** according to HAR Chapter 11-261.

3. Those who generate LBP waste as a result of abatement, rehabilitation, renovation and remodeling in homes and other residences are exempt from **hazardous waste laws**. However, generators shall follow state and local requirements for proper disposal of non-hazardous LBP waste.

4. Non-hazardous LBP waste (including “residential LBP waste” defined in a Federal Register “Proposed Rule”¹) is a subset of construction & demolition (C&D) waste that requires special handling. Non-hazardous LBP waste is also referred to as a special waste. “Special wastes” means any solid waste that, because of its source or physical, chemical, or biological characteristics, require special consideration for its proper processing or disposal, or both. This term includes, but is not limited to, asbestos, lead acid batteries, municipal waste combustion ash, sewage sludge that is non-hazardous, medical wastes, tires, white goods, and derelict vehicles.²

**LBP Waste Disposal**
Dispose of non-hazardous LBP waste at permitted municipal solid waste landfills or

---
¹ Federal Register, October 23, 2001, Vol. 66, No. 205, pp. 53566-53573
² Section 11-58.1-03, Hawai‘i Administrative Rules

Eff. January 1, 2003
permitted C&D waste landfills, such as PVT and Waimanalo Gulch (Oahu); Central Maui, Ma'alea, Molokai, Hana, and Lanai (Maui County); Pu’uanahulu and Hilo (Hawaii’i); and Kekaha (Kauai).

Landfills in Hawaii’i are also subject to further waste acceptance restrictions imposed by county governments. For example, since 1994 the City & County of Honolulu restricted municipal solid waste landfills from accepting loads containing C&D waste greater than 10% in volume.

Disposal of “residential LBP waste” defined in the Federal Register\(^3\) (CHART 1):

**STEP 1** Qualified or knowledgeable personnel select an LBP identification method (e.g., prior knowledge) and determine if waste contains LBP.

**STEP 2** Dispose with regular household rubbish ([homeowners conducting do-it-yourself activities ONLY](#)), OR

Send to permitted landfill: complete a Waste Profile that will provide the landfill with written notification of incoming LBP waste.

**RESIDENTIAL ABATEMENT PROJECTS:** also containerize, solidify and label LBP wastes that are paint chips, dust, and/or sludges:

1. Use durable containers such as steel paint cans.
2. Solidification may be by methods such as cement (for dust and chips) or absorbent material (for sludges).
3. Labeling needs to say “Lead Based Paint Waste”.

**STEP 3** Declare to the landfill operator that the incoming load contains LBP waste.

Disposal of residential demolition LBP waste, and non-residential LBP waste (CHART 2):

**STEP 1** Qualified or knowledgeable personnel select the proper LBP identification method, and determine if waste contains LBP.

**STEP 2** Make a hazardous waste determination by applying knowledge and by testing. The Hazardous Waste Program (808) 586-4226 has a copy of the procedures.

**STEP 3** Dispose properly based on the outcome of the hazardous waste determination (Section 11-262-11, HAR):

1. If the TCLP result for lead is equal to 5 ppm or greater, the LBP waste is a hazardous waste that must be disposed at a hazardous waste landfill. Landfills in Hawaii’i do not accept hazardous wastes.

---

\(^3\) Federal Register, October 23, 2001, Vol. 66, No. 205, pp. 53566-53573

Eff. January 1, 2003
2. If the TCLP result is less than 5 ppm, the LBP waste is a solid waste and may be disposed at Hawai‘i landfills that accept construction and demolition wastes. Complete a Waste Profile that will provide the landfill with written notification of incoming LBP waste.

NON-HAZARDOUS, NON-RESIDENTIAL ABATEMENT LBP WASTES:
containerize, solidify and label LBP wastes that are paint chips, dust, and/or sludges:

(1) Use durable containers such as steel paint cans.
(2) Solidification may be by methods such as cement (for dust and chips) or absorbent material (for sludges).
(3) Labeling needs to say “Lead Based Paint Waste”.

STEP 4  ALL NON-HAZARDOUS LBP WASTES: Declare to the landfill operator that the incoming load contains LBP waste.

LBP waste shall not be recycled. The U.S. EPA believes that LBP waste that is shredded or chopped into mulch, ground cover, or topsoil or for site leveling, fill or roadbed material may cause health risks through ingestion of LBP, dust, or contaminated soil. Further EPA studies have shown that lead is relatively immobile in subsurface soils under non-highly acidic conditions, but may increase in mobility through soil layers to groundwater if soil conditions are more acidic.

Pre-Demolition or Renovation BMPS
To identify and prepare architectural components containing LBP for disposal, the DOH strongly recommends generators and contractors to implement the following practices, prior to demolition or renovation:

- Identify building components that contain LBP for selective removal during the demolition or renovation stage. NOTE: components that are selectively removed are subject to a hazardous waste determination, unless the structure is residential, and work is related to renovation or LBP abatement.

- Abate surfaces. Abate building components to meet the HUD lead limit of 1.0 mg/cm² or 0.5% by weight. Treated lumber with LBP, even if abated, may not be recycled into mulch, ground cover, topsoil, fill or roadbed material.

LBP concrete that is completely abated to where it is no longer considered LBP waste may be recycled.

- Test representative samples of the waste to determine if their total lead content falls below the lead limit. A guidance document for measuring lead in paint is available from the DOH Lead Program (808) 586-5800, or the Solid Waste Section (808) 586-4226.

Eff. January 1, 2003
DOH also provides education on LBP sampling as part of the EPA lead accreditation program, which is administered by the DOH Lead Program. The main objective of the accreditation program is to train persons who will be responsible for conducting lead paint abatement activities.

For a current list of permitted landfills contact the Solid Waste Section (808) 586-4226.

Reference


APPROVED / DISAPPROVED

Loretta J. Puddy, A.C.S.W., M.P.H.
Acting Director of Health
Department of Health

DEC 23 2002

Date

Eff. January 1, 2003
Chart 1
Disposal of Residential Lead-Based Paint (LBP) Waste

NOTES:
1. Residential sources include single family homes, apartment buildings, row houses, military barracks, and college dormitories.
2. Recommended handling of residential LBP chips, dust and sludge: solidify, containerize and label prior to disposal.
3. Waste notification to the landfill is required.
4. Non-LBP wastes containing hazardous substances (e.g., treated lumber) shall be disposed and not recycled.
Chart 2
Disposal of Residential Demolition and Non-residential Lead-Based Paint Waste

NOTES:
1. Non-residential LBP wastes are subject to hazardous waste determination.
2. Non-LBP wastes containing hazardous substances (e.g., treated lumber) shall be disposed and not recycled.
STATE OF HAWAI’I
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE BRANCH
OFFICE OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

DISPOSAL OF LEAD-BASED PAINT WASTE
ADDENDUM

Applicable Federal Laws and Actions

- According to Section 403 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), as amended, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) defines lead-based paint (LBP) as paint with lead levels equal to or exceeding 1.0 milligram per square centimeter (mg/cm²) or 0.5% by weight.

- The U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) has similarly defined lead-based paint as any paint, varnish, shellac or other coating that contains lead equal to or greater than 1.0 mg/cm² as measured by x-ray fluorescence (XRF) or laboratory analysis, or 0.5 percent by weight (5,000 µg/g, 5,000 ppm, or 5,000 mg/kg) as measured by laboratory analysis.  

- In 1978, the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) banned the sale of residential paint containing greater than 0.06% lead (a trace amount). The CPSC also prohibited the use of such paint in residences and other areas where consumers have direct contact with painted surfaces.

- An EPA policy entitled Update on Lead-based Paint dated August 2000 states that residential LBP waste is not subject to Resource Conservation & Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle C (Federal hazardous waste) regulations. “Contractors can manage residential lead-based paint waste as household waste.” Residential sources of LBP waste include but are not limited to single-family homes, apartment buildings, row houses, military barracks and college dormitories.

- The EPA defined “residential lead-based paint waste” in a Federal Register “Proposed Rule”, October 23, 2001 (Vol. 66, No. 205). Residential lead-based paint waste is waste generated as a result of lead-based paint activities (including abatement, rehabilitation, renovation and remodeling) in homes and other residences. The term includes but is not limited to lead-based paint debris, chips, dust, and sludges. The term does not include LBP wastes from demolition activities.

- The EPA interprets residential LBP waste to be household waste under 40 CFR 261.4(b)(1).

---

4 Guidelines for the Evaluation and Control of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Housing (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1997 Revision)

Eff. January 1, 2003
Applicable State of Hawai’i Laws

- Hazardous waste regulations, known on the federal level as RCRA Subtitle C\(^5\) are enforced within the State of Hawai’i under Hawai’i Revised Statutes (HRS) 342J and Hawai’i Administrative Rules (HAR) Title 11, Chapters 261 through 280. Chapter 11-261, HAR defines “household waste” as “any material (including garbage, trash and sanitary wastes in septic tanks) derived from households (including single and multiple residences, hotels and motels, bunkhouses, ranger stations, crew quarters, campgrounds, picnic grounds and day-use recreation areas).” *This definition is identical to the Federal definition (40 CFR 261.4(b)(1)).*

- Solid waste regulations, are enforced within the State of Hawai’i under HRS 342H and HAR Title 11, Chapter 58.1 (11-58.1), and provide broader authority to the Department of Health (DOH) than federal regulations, known as RCRA Subtitle D\(^6\).

---

\(^5\) Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (40 CFR Parts 261 to 280)

\(^6\) Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (40 CFR Parts 256)
Steven Y. K. Chang, P.E., Chief
Department of Health
Solid and Hazardous Waste Branch
State of Hawai‘i
Post Office Box 3378
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96801-3378

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i (SM1 2009/0008 and EA 2009/0004)

Dear Mr. Chang:

Thank you for your letter dated July 28, 2009, providing comments on the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we wish to provide the following information in response to your comments.

1. In regards to the determination of whether any demolition building components contain hazardous waste, the applicant has contracted BENDCO, a company experienced in abatement and remediation, site demolition and removal, and hazardous materials surveying and sampling.

2. The applicant confirms that any non-hazardous building components containing lead-based paint (LBP) will not be recycled, but rather will be disposed of at a Department of Health (DOH) permitted facility.

3. You have the applicant’s assurances that arrangements will be made with a DOH-permitted facility, as necessary, for the disposition of any unpainted, uncontaminated concrete from demolition or new construction. Furthermore, BENDCO will ensure that any wastes that fail the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) test for hazardous waste will be appropriately managed.

4. The applicant confirms that, prior to demolition, non-hazardous concrete containing LBP will be separated from concrete intended for recycling. The non-hazardous concrete containing LBP will be sent to a DOH-permitted disposal
facility. Pending the acquisition of the necessary permits and regulatory approvals, the applicant will notify the Solid and Hazardous Waste Branch as to when demolition and abatement activities will occur.

5. The applicant confirms that, as applicable, only the uncontaminated concrete that meets the definition of “inert fill material” as defined by Section 342H-1, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS), will be reused on-site.

6. The applicant provides its assurance that any waste gypsum board and plaster resulting from either demolition or reconstruction will be disposed properly.

7. The applicant confirms that any treated wood waste resulting from demolition or new construction will be disposed of at a DOH-permitted facility, not recycled.

8. To the extent practicable, glass resulting from demolition will be reused in new construction. The applicant confirms that any non-reusable glass will be taken to a DOH-permitted disposal facility.

9. The applicant confirms that any waste appliances or “white goods” that do not contain refrigeration units will be sent to a scrap metal recycler.

10. The landscaping plans for the new restaurant prescribe the reuse of certain mature trees currently in existence on the property. Meanwhile, the applicant confirms that greenwaste will be sent to a permitted composting facility.

The applicant understands that the comments provided were sent solely in regards to solid and hazardous waste disposal issues. It is noted that the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application have been sent to other Federal, State, and County agencies which are involved in the oversight and implementation of various aspects of the proposed project, for their review and comment.
Thank you again for your comments. Should you have any questions surrounding the subject project, please feel free to call me at (808) 244-2015.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
cc:  Mike Yamamoto, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
     Kurt Wollenhaupt, County of Maui, Department of Planning
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Attention: Ms. Kimberly Skog

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment and SMA Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction

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

Other than the comments from Engineering Division, the Department of Land and Natural Resources has no other comments to offer on the subject matter. Should you have any questions, please feel free to call our office at 587-0433. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Morris M. Atta
Administrator
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: [Signature]

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment and SMA Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction

LOCATION: Lahaina, Maui

APPLICANT: McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.

Transmitted for your review and comment on the above referenced document. We would appreciate your comments on this document. Please submit any comments by July 20, 2009.

If no response is received by this date, we will assume your agency has no comments. If you have any questions about this request, please contact my office at 587-0433. Thank you.

Attachments

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

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 7/8/09
COMMENTS

(X) We confirm that the project site, according to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), is located in Zone C. The Flood Insurance Program does not have any regulations for developments within Zone C.

( ) Please take note that the project site, according to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), is located in Zone.

( ) Please note that the correct Flood Zone Designation for the project site according to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) is ___.

( ) Please note that the project must comply with the rules and regulations of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) presented in Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44CFR), whenever development within a Special Flood Hazard Area is undertaken. If there are any questions, please contact the State NFIP Coordinator, Ms. Carol Tyau-Beam, of the Department of Land and Natural Resources, Engineering Division at (808) 587-0267.

Please be advised that 44CFR indicates the minimum standards set forth by the NFIP. Your Community’s local flood ordinance may prove to be more restrictive and thus take precedence over the minimum NFIP standards. If there are questions regarding the local flood ordinances, please contact the applicable County NFIP Coordinators below:

( ) Mr. Robert Sumitomo at (808) 768-8097 or Mr. Mario Siu Li at (808) 768-8098 of the City and County of Honolulu, Department of Planning and Permitting.

( ) Mr. Kelly Gomes at (808) 961-8327 (Hilo) or Mr. Kiran Emler at (808) 327-3530 (Kona) of the County of Hawaii, Department of Public Works.

( ) Mr. Francis Cerizo at (808) 270-7771 of the County of Maui, Department of Planning.

( ) Mr. Mario Antonio at (808) 241-6620 of the County of Kauai, Department of Public Works.

( ) The applicant should include water demands and infrastructure required to meet project needs. Please note that projects within State lands requiring water service from the Honolulu Board of Water Supply system will be required to pay a resource development charge, in addition to Water Facilities Charges for transmission and daily storage.

( ) The applicant should provide the water demands and calculations to the Engineering Division so it can be included in the State Water Projects Plan Update.

( ) Additional Comments:

( ) Other:

Should you have any questions, please call Ms. Suzie S. Agraan of the Planning Branch at 587-0258.

Signed: [Signature]
ERIC T. HIRANO, CHIEF ENGINEER

Date: [Date]

[Authorized Signature]
Morris Atta, Administrator
Department of Land and
Natural Resources
Engineering Division
State of Hawaiʻi
Post Office Box 621
Honolulu, Hawaiʻi 96809

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction; TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaiʻi (SM1 2009/0008 and EA 2009/0004)

Dear Mr. Atta:

Thank you for your letter dated July 22, 2009, providing comments on the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we wish to provide the following information in response to your comments.

The applicant concurs that the project site is located in Zone C, according to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). The applicant understands that there are no regulations imposed by the Flood Insurance Program for developments within Zone C.
Again, thank you for your comments. Should you have any questions regarding the subject project, please feel free to call me at (808)244-2015.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
    Kurt Wollenhaupt, Department of Planning
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Attention: Ms. Kimberly Skog

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment and SMA Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction

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

The Department of Land and Natural Resources has no other comments to offer on the subject matter. Should you have any questions, please feel free to call our office at 587-0433. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Morris M. Atta
Administrator
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Morris M. Atta

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment and SMA Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction

LOCATION: Lahaina, Maui
APPLICANT: McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.

Transmitted for your review and comment on the above referenced document. We would appreciate your comments on this document. Please submit any comments by July 20, 2009.

If no response is received by this date, we will assume your agency has no comments. If you have any questions about this request, please contact my office at 587-0433. Thank you.

Attachments

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

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 7-29-09
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Morris M. Atta

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment and SMA Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction

LOCATION: Lahaina, Maui
APPLICANT: McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.

Transmitted for your review and comment on the above referenced document. We would appreciate your comments on this document. Please submit any comments by July 20, 2009.

If no response is received by this date, we will assume your agency has no comments. If you have any questions about this request, please contact my office at 587-0433. Thank you.

Attachments

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

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 6/22/09
DIVISION OF AQUATIC RESOURCES - MAUI
DEPARTMENT OF LAND & NATURAL RESOURCES
130 Mahalani Street
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793
July 22, 2009

To: Alton Miyasaka, Aquatic Biologist

From: Skippy Hau, Aquatic Biologist

Subject: Draft EA and SMA Use Permit application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction (DAR 2443) (Comments to Morris Atta (Land) by July 20, 2009)

I have no objections and look forward to seeing more landscaping plants with a more pleasant view for Lahaina town (Appendix F).

If possible, I would like to see less impervious surfaces (Appendix A) along with redirection of drainage runoff to landscaped areas which would reduce the need for sprinklers or watering.

Other palms besides coconut trees might better for the limited space. Too often, coconut trees have been over-trimmed, grow too tall, and must constantly be removed of fruit for liability purposes. Using shorter native palms might be easier to maintain.
September 22, 2009

Morris M. Atta, Administrator  
Department of Land and Natural Resources  
Land Division  
State of Hawai‘i  
Post Office Box 621  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96809

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i (SM1 2009/0008 and EA 2009/0004)

Dear Mr. Atta:

This letter is written in response to comments received from the Division of Aquatic Resources, dated July 22, 2009 regarding the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we wish to provide the following information in response to the comments received.

Comment A: If possible, I would like to see less impervious surfaces (Appendix A) along with redirection of drainage runoff to landscaped areas which would reduce the need for sprinklers or watering.

Response: In comparison to existing conditions, the proposed drainage plan for the subject project will result in a reduction in impervious surfaces by 842 square feet, with an increase in landscaped area of the same amount. Notwithstanding, the applicant is investigating the use of pervious surface treatments for the paved areas as well as the retention of runoff in landscaped areas.

Comment B: Other palms besides coconut trees might better for the limited space. Too often, coconut trees have been over-trimmed, grow too tall, and must constantly be removed of fruit for liability purposes. Using shorter native palms might be easier to maintain.
Response: The applicant notes that the coconut trees shown in the landscaping plan are mature trees which are currently in existence onsite, and as such, these trees will be maintained. However, aside from these existing trees, other palms included in the landscaping plan are of shorter and native varieties.

Thank you for your comments. Should you have any questions regarding the subject project, please feel free to call me at (808) 244-2015.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp

cc: Kurt Wollenhaupt, County of Maui, Department of Planning
    Mike Yamamoto, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
    Conrad Shiroma, Kim & Shiroma Engineers, Inc.
    Kevin Tanaka, Landscape Architect
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Ms. Kimberly Skog  
Planner  
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, Hawaii  96793  

Dear Ms. Skog:  

Subject: Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction  
Draft Environmental Assessment (EA 2009/0004) and  
Special Management Area Use Permit (SM1 2009/0008)  
TMK: 4-5-001: 019  

Thank you for requesting the State Department of Transportation’s (DOT) review of the subject project to demolish and reconstruct the Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant, which is located on the corner of Papalaua Street and Waine’s Street in Lahaina.  

During the project’s early consultation phase, DOT provided comments on the subject project in letter STP 8.3078, dated December 30, 2008. These comments are still applicable. DOT does not anticipate any adverse significant impacts to its transportation infrastructure as a result of the proposed project.  

DOT appreciates the opportunity to provide comments. If there are any questions, please contact Mr. David Shimokawa of the DOT Statewide Transportation Planning Office at telephone number (808) 587-2356.  

Very truly yours,  

Francis Paul Keeno  

BRENNON T. MORIOKA, Ph.D., P.E.  
Director of Transportation
August 20, 2009

Brennon T. Morioka, Director  
Department of Transportation  
State of Hawai‘i  
869 Punchbowl Street  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813-5097

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction; TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i (SM1 2009/0008 and EA 2009/0004)

Dear Mr. Morioka,

Thank you for your letter dated July 14, 2009, providing comments on the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we wish to provide the following in response to your comments.

The applicant acknowledges that your previous comment letter regarding the subject project, STP 8.3078 dated December 30, 2008, is still applicable. In this respect, it is noted that said letter indicated the Department had “no comments” on the subject project. Further, the proposed action does not involve work within the State right-of-way, therefore, adverse significant impacts to the State’s transportation infrastructure are not anticipated.

Again, thank you for your comments. Should you have any questions regarding the subject project, please feel free to call me at 244-2015.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp  
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.  
    Kurt Wollenhaupt, Department of Planning
Mr. Kurt F. Wollenhaupt
Staff Planner
Department of Planning
County of Maui
250 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Mr. Wollenhaupt:

Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction Located at Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii‘i

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed project. After review of the Draft Environmental Assessment you have sent for this project, we have no consultation comments to make. The proposed area falls within coverage arcs of existing warning sirens.

If you have any questions please call Ms. Havinne Okamura, Hazard Mitigation Planner, at (808) 733-4300, extension 556.

Sincerely,

EDWARD T. TEIXEIRA
Vice Director of Civil Defense

c: Ms. Kimberly Skog, Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
July 17, 2009

Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, HI 96793

RE: Request for comments on the proposed reconstruction of McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawai‘i, Inc., Lahaina Restaurant, Lahaina, Maui, TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019.

Aloha e Kimberly Skog,

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) is in receipt of the above-mentioned letter dated June 19, 2009. OHA has reviewed the project and offers the following comments.

OHA understands that the proposed action consists of the reconstruction of an existing building and is complimentary to the surrounding land uses, including the historic district. We further note that the current site is completely paved over with the exception of some limited landscaping.

As such, OHA would like to suggest that the project area be landscaped with drought tolerant native or indigenous species that are common to the area. Doing so would not only serve as practical water-saving landscaping practices, but also serve to further the traditional Hawaiian concept of mālama ʻāina and create a more Hawaiian sense of place. This would also help to reduce the amount of impervious surfaces in the project area, thereby reducing runoff as well. Tree and landscape planting to shade paved parking areas and provide shade and cooling to building elements and outdoor use areas should also be considered.

OHA also asks that, in accordance with Section 6E-46.6, Hawaii Revised Statutes and Chapter 13-300, Hawaii Administrative Rules, if the project moves forward, and if any significant cultural deposits or human skeletal remains are encountered, work shall stop in the immediate vicinity and the State Historic Preservation Division shall be contacted.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have further questions, please contact Grant Arnold by phone at (808) 594-0263 or e-mail him at granta@oha.org.

‘O wau iho nō me ka ‘oia‘i‘o,

Clyde W. Nāmu‘o
Administrator

C: OHA Maui CRC

County of Maui Department of Planning
250 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793
August 20, 2009

Clyde W. Nāmuʻo
Office of Hawaiian Affairs
State of Hawaiʻi
711 Kapiʻolani Boulevard, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaiʻi 96813

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction; TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaiʻi (SM1 2009/0008 and EA 2009/0004)

Dear Mr. Nāmuʻo:

Thank you for your letter dated July 17, 2009, providing comments on the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we wish to provide the following information in response to your comments.

With the redesign of the parking lot and addition of a double drive-thru lane, the hard (impervious) surface area will be reduced by approximately 842 square feet, and the total planted area will increase by the same amount. In effect, it is anticipated that runoff will be reduced by approximately 0.07 cubic feet per second (cfs). The preliminary landscaping plan incorporates a variety of native and indigenous species, including Hawaiian kou, hapuʻu, ʻilima papa, and nehe, among others. A number of shade trees will surround the parking lot to provide cooling for this outdoor area.

You have the applicant’s assurances that in the event any human skeletal remains or items of Native Hawaiian cultural or traditional significance are inadvertently encountered during construction, work will cease and the State Historic Preservation Division will be notified immediately.
Again, thank you for your comments. Should you have any questions regarding the subject project, please feel free to call me at (808)244-2015.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
Kevin Tanaka, Landscape Architect
Kurt Wollenhaupt, Department of Planning
The Senate
STATE CAPITOL
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

July 15, 2009

Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793
Attn: Kimberly Skog, Planner

Dear Ms. Skog,

I am writing in support of the request for a concurrent review of the Draft Environmental Assessment and the Special Management Area Use Permit for the Lahaina McDonald's. Since the opening of the Lahaina McDonald's in 1983, the restaurant has continued to provide a valuable service to our community and visitors alike. The proposed renovations and updates will enable the business to continue to flourish and provide quality service for which this McDonald's is known.

In reviewing the Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit Application, there seems to be no negative impacts resulting from the proposed demolition and rebuilding of the Lahaina McDonald's. The environmental assessment and SMA application appears to have thoroughly addressed many of the concerns and issues arising from the proposed renovation of the Lahaina McDonald's.

I support the opportunity for our current businesses to flourish. Moving the planning and approval process expeditiously is especially helpful in this economic climate. I respectfully request your favorable consideration and action on this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Senator Rosalyn H. Baker
5th District, South and West Maui
July 6, 2009

Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawai’i 96793

Dear Ms. Skog,

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2) 4-5-001:019.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area use permit application for the reconstruction of Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant located at the corner of Papalaua Street and Waine’e Street in Lahaina.

Based on the anticipated Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), my administration is in favor of this project moving forward.

Sincerely,

CHARMAINE TAVARES
Mayor, County of Maui

CT: rs/ad
xc: Kurt Wollenhaupt, Staff Planner, Department of Planning
     Roy Silva, Executive Assistant, Mayor’s Office
Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hirago, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Subject: Draft EA and SMA Use Permit application for the proposed McDonald's
Restaurant Reconstruction, Lahaina, HI; TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019

Dear Ms. Skog,

The Department of Fire and Public Safety has reviewed the Draft Environmental
Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit application for the reconstruction
of the Lahaina McDonald's. We do not have any concerns to address at this time. A
detailed review of the proposed project will be conducted by our office during the
building permit process.

Please feel free to contact Captain Val Martin of our Fire Prevention Bureau at
244-9161 if you have any questions or concerns regarding this subject.

Sincerely,

Valerie Brandon
Firefighter I
Fire Prevention Bureau

For: Valeriano F. Martin
Captain
Fire Prevention Bureau
July 9, 2009

Ms. Kimberly Skog
Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii’I (SM1 2009/0008) (EA 009/0004)

The Department has reviewed the Applications for Special Management Area Use Permit and Draft Environmental Assessment for the above subject project. Based on our review, we have determined that the subject project is not subject to Chapter 2.96, Maui County Code. At the present time, the department has no additional comments to offer.

Please call Mr. Wayde Oshiro of our Housing Division at 270-7355 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

LORI TSUHAKO, LSW, ACSW
Director of Housing and Human Concerns

cc: Kurt Wollenhaupt, Staff Planner, Department of Planning Housing Division
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS & RECREATION
700 Hali‘a Nakoa Street, Unit 2, Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

June 25, 2009

Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
Attention: Kimberly Skog, Planner
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurants Reconstruction at TMK (2) 4-5-001: 019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i (SM1 2009/0008) (EA 2009/0004)

Dear Ms. Skog:

We have reviewed the above referenced documents for the proposed reconstruction of the Lahaina McDonald’s restaurant and have no comments at this time.

Please feel free to contact me or Mr. Patrick Matsui, Chief of Parks Planning and Development, at 270-7387 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

TAMARA HORCAJO
Director

C: Kurt Wollenhaupt, Department of Planning, Staff Planner
Patrick Matsui, Chief of Parks Planning & Development

TH: PTM:bks
Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) FOR THE PROPOSED LAHAINA MCDONALD’S RESTAURANT RECONSTRUCTION AND RELATED IMPROVEMENTS, LOCATED IN LAHAINA, MAUI, HAWAII; TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019 (SM1 2009/0008) (EA 2009/0004)

At its regularly scheduled meeting of July 14, 2009, the Maui Planning Commission reviewed the above-referenced document and provided the following comment:

1. Review proposed drainage plan to determine feasibility and potential measures to retain all storm water runoff on-site or to significantly increase the amount of runoff retained on-site. Investigate the use of pervious surfaces, on-site retention areas, and other means of reducing off-site water runoff.

Please provide written responses to the above comments in the Final EA. Thank you for your cooperation. Should you require further clarification, please contact Staff Planner Kurt Wollenhaupt by email at kurt.wollenhaupt@mauicounty.gov or by phone at (808) 270-1789.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY S. HUNT, AICP
Planning Director

XC: Clayton I. Yoshida, AICP, Planning Program Administrator
Kurt F. Wollenhaupt, Staff Planner
EA Permit File
Project File
General File

JSH:KFW:sg
k:\wp_docs\planning\sm1\2009\0008\lahainamcdonalds\mpccomments\ltr.doc
Jeffrey S. Hunt, Director
County of Maui
Department of Planning
250 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii (EA 2009/0004 and SMA 2009/0008)

Dear Mr. Hunt:

This letter is sent in response to your letter, dated July 21, 2009, regarding comments provided by the Maui Planning Commission (MPC) during their review of the Draft EA for the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we offer the following information in response to the comment received from the MPC:

The project engineer has investigated a variety of measures for increasing the amount of storm water runoff retained on-site. See Attachment “A”. For reference, the existing drainage system includes two (2) onsite drain inlets, while runoff from streetfront landscaped areas is directed to the adjacent County roadways. The alternatives investigated by the project engineer include the following: (1) increase landscaped area and install a hydrodynamic separator (Vortsentry or CDS) at the downstream drain inlet; (2) utilize landscaped areas for storm water retention; (3) install pervious concrete pavement; and (4) install underground water storage chambers.

The four (4) design alternatives were assessed in the context of ensuring that the quality of storm water leaving the property is improved over existing conditions, minimizing impacts to offsite drainage systems, and heeding technical limitations associated with the clayey, slow-draining soils that underlay the project site. The investigation concluded that the recommended drainage solution involve an increase in landscaped area and the installation of a hydrodynamic separator at the downstream drain inlet. These improvements achieve the objective of reducing storm water runoff while significantly improving the quality of storm water runoff leaving the site.
This information will be incorporated into the Final EA for the subject project. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 244-2015.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
Enclosure
cc: Kurt Wollenhaupt, County of Maui, Department of Planning (w/enclosure)
    Mike Yamamoto, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc. (w/out enclosure)
    Conrad Shiroma, Kim & Shiroma Engineers, Inc. (w/out enclosure)
March 26, 2010

McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 2000
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Mr. Mike Yamamoto

SUBJECT: Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction
885 Wainee Street
Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii
TMK (2) 4-5-001:019

Gentlemen:

The County of Maui, Department of Planning, in their letter dated July 21, 2009, indicated that McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii should "Review proposed drainage plan to determine feasibility and potential measures to retain all storm water runoff on-site or to significantly increase the amount of runoff retained on-site. Investigate the use of pervious surfaces, on-site retention areas, and other means of reducing off-site water runoff."

In response to the comment, we have reviewed the feasibility and potential measures to increase the amount of storm water runoff retained onsite. Before examining these alternatives, we provide the following overview of the drainage system currently proposed.

1. **DRAINAGE SYSTEM OVERVIEW AND ENGINEERING CONSIDERATIONS**

The current runoff volume from the project site is 1.93 cubic feet per second (cfs). The reconstruction of the restaurant will result in a decrease in storm water runoff due to the proposed increase in landscaped areas. The landscaped area will increase from 4,526 square feet (sf) to 5,368 sf. The resulting decrease in storm water runoff from a 10-year storm is 0.07 cfs, yielding a post-development runoff volume of 1.86 cfs. Runoff from the site currently flows to a 36 inch drainline in Papalaua Street.

Modifications to the existing drainage system for the project calls for the installation of a hydrodynamic separator (Vortex or CDS) at the downstream drain inlet prior to flow from the site entering the County's drainage system. The hydrodynamic separator will remove oils and related petroleum pollutants as well as 80 percent of the total suspended solids (TSS) up to the 100 micron particle size that may be contained in the storm water runoff from the paved areas. Information for the hydrodynamic separators is enclosed hereto as Exhibit "A". The proposed drainage solution is in keeping with the County of Maui's drainage regulations.

ATTACHMENT "A"
We have reviewed the soils report by Hirata & Associates, Inc., dated August 6, 2007. Their investigation indicated the presence of firm to medium stiff clayey silt to depths of 7 feet along Wainee Street, down to 12 feet along the makai boundary below the existing pavement.

The report recommended that the onsite clayey silt subgrade for the slab-on-grade areas be scarified to a minimum depth of 12 inches, moisture conditioned to slightly above the optimum moisture content, and compacted to a minimum 90 percent compaction as determined by ASTM D1557.

The clayey silt material appears to be slightly expansive or clayed in nature, as the soils report requires the subgrade material be moisture conditioned to above optimum moisture content prior to compaction. In lay terms, the soil characteristics at the property are characterized as very slow draining, a condition which must be considered in the engineering analysis for drainage improvements.

II. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

A. Utilize Landscaped Areas for Added Retention

1. **Design Concept:** The use of the landscaped areas for storm water retention was reviewed. A 12-inch thick gravel layer would be placed in the landscaped areas along Papalaua Street and Wainee Street. Together, these landscaped areas total about 1,275 s.f. with a total storage volume of 425 cf.

Based on a 10-year storm with a runoff rate of 1.86 cfs, this 425 cf storage volume will be filled in approximately four (4) minutes with the runoff from the McDonald’s site. Any additional runoff generated from the McDonald’s site will be discharged into the Papalaua Street drainage system.

Runoff stored in the landscaped areas will percolate into the ground. As noted above, percolation into the clayey silt subgrade will be very slow due to the nature of the subgrade material.

2. **Analysis:** This concept is not considered practical given the high content clay subsoil which will limit percolation and result in overflow of unfiltered storm water into the Papalaua Street drainline. Additionally, consultation with the landscape architect confirmed that prolonged introduction of oil and petroleum substances into the landscaped areas will result in the need to
replace the gravel and replant these areas on a higher frequency maintenance schedule. The owner of the restaurant has indicated that maintenance programming for the restaurant must be optimal as profitability of operations, particularly during slower economic times, requires that restaurant systems be designed with efficient maintenance requirements in mind.

B. Utilize Pervious Concrete Pavement

1. **Design Concept:** Pervious concrete pavement was reviewed for use for storm water retention in the onsite paved areas. Based upon the recommendations from the soils consultant, the only suitable area available for storm water retention/detention would be the parking area between the new building and Papalaua Street. Due to the high volume of traffic anticipated from customers, heavy weight trash trucks and delivery vehicles, the entry driveway from Papalaua Street and the double drive-thru area was excluded.

The area proposed for pervious paving encompasses approximately 3,733 s.f. A pervious concrete pavement thickness of 6 inches and a base course thickness of 6 inches will provide about 1,245 cf. of storage volume. A concrete curb will be required on all four (4) sides of the paved area and should extend about 6 inches into the subgrade. The pervious pavement system will be separated from the subgrade with a layer of geotextile fabric. This fabric will prevent the infiltration of the subgrade material into the base course layer.

Based on a 10-year storm with a runoff rate of 1.86 cfs, the 1,245-cf storage volume will be filled in approximately 12 minutes with runoff from the McDonald's site. Any additional runoff generated from the McDonald's site will be discharged into the Papalaua Street drainage system.

2. **Analysis:** Once the storm has passed, the runoff caught in the pervious concrete pavement will percolate into the subgrade or evaporate. Percolation of the storm water into the subgrade will be very slow due to the clayey silt material at the subgrade. Due to the low porosity of the subgrade material, the pervious concrete pavement will be exposed to prolonged wet cycles which may cause an early failure to the pavement, due to softening of the subgrade. In addition, degradation in the pavement design may render the drainage function less effective than called for by design. As with the landscaped area design
concept described above, excess water not accommodated by the pervious concrete will flow unfiltered into the Papalaua Street drainline. The pervious concrete pavement will require constant maintenance that will include vacuuming to remove silts and other debris that can clog the openings in the concrete pavement.

C. **Install Underground Water Chamber**

1. **Design Concept:** A second storm water retention system, which involves the storing of storm water runoff in underground chambers, was also reviewed.

These underground chambers are made of high density polyethylene and measure 8.5 ft. long x 5 ft. wide and 34 inches high; 42 chambers are proposed to be placed in the parking area. A hydrodynamic separator will be required to remove trash, silts and other objects from the drainage system before the runoff can enter the chamber system.

The chamber system is to be surrounded by crushed aggregate, and requires a 6-inch layer of this material above and below the chamber system. The top of the chamber needs to be buried a minimum of 2 feet below grade.

Each chamber can store 75 cf of water, and additional water can be stored within the surrounding aggregate. It is estimated that the total storage volume would be 4,725 cf.

Based on a 10-year storm with a runoff rate of 1.86 cfs, this 4,725-cf storage volume will be filled in approximately 42 minutes with the runoff from the McDonald’s site. Any additional runoff generated from the McDonald’s site will be discharged into the Papalaua Street drainage system.

Runoff stored in the chamber system will have to percolate into the ground. As noted above, percolation into the clayey silt subgrade will be very slow due to the nature of the subgrade material.

2. **Analysis:** This alternative is workable with an additional construction cost of $80,000.00. This added cost reflects an estimated increase in project cost of 6.7 percent over the initial bid estimate of $1.2 million. Therefore, a business decision will
be required to determine whether this option is feasible in the context of the project's overall programmed budget.

III. RECOMMENDATION

Engineering analysis and recommendations are based on thorough review of technical data affecting the elements of design, the overall objective of the design, and cost-benefit parameters of each solution given the context of the design objective.

In reviewing the foregoing alternatives, we recommend that the original drainage solution involving the increase of landscaped areas and the installation of hydrodynamic separator be pursued. The basis for our recommendation is as follows:

1. Technical limitations associated with high clay content soil does not warrant the storage of water in landscaped or paved areas (via pervious pavement).

2. The objective of the design is to ensure that the quality of storm water leaving the property is improved over existing conditions. This objective is being achieved with the use of the hydrodynamic separator.

3. The contribution of 1.86 cfs to the 36 inch drainline in Papalaua Street represents a very small portion of the capacity of the drainline and will not affect onsite drainage systems in an adverse way; rather, the 1.86 cfs contribution represents a 0.07 cfs reduction from existing runoff conditions.

4. The cost of the underground chamber alternative does not appear warranted, given that the objectives of reducing drainage flows from the site and improving the quality of storm water leaving the site are being addressed with the recommended solution.

Please contact me if there are any questions regarding this letter.

Very truly yours,

KIM & SHIROMA ENGINEERS, INC.

By: [Signature]
Conrad T. Shiroma, P.E.
President

Enclosure
Hydrodynamic Separation Products Overview
High performance hydrodynamic separation

The Vortechs system is a high-performance hydrodynamic separator that effectively removes finer sediment, oil and grease, and floating and sinking debris. Its swirl concentrator and flow controls work together to minimize turbulence and provide stable storage of captured pollutants. The design also allows for easy inspection and unobstructed maintenance access. With comprehensive lab and field testing, the system delivers proven results and site-specific solutions.

Precast models can treat peak design flows up to 25 cfs; cast-in-place models handle even greater flows. A typical system is sized to provide an 80% load reduction based on laboratory-verified removal efficiencies for varying particle size distributions such as 50-micron sediment particles.

How does it work?

Water enters the swirl chamber at a tangent, inducing a gentle swirling flow pattern and enhancing gravitational separation. Sinking pollutants stay in the swirl chamber while floating pollutants are stopped at the baffle wall. Typically Vortechs systems are sized such that 80% or more of runoff through the system will be controlled exclusively by the low flow control. This orifice effectively reduces inflow velocity and turbulence by inducing a slight backwater appropriate to the site.

During larger storms, the water level rises above the low flow control and begins to flow through the high flow control. The layer of floating pollutants is elevated above the influent pipe, preventing re-entrainment. Swirling action increases in relation to the storm intensity, which helps prevent re-suspension. When the storm drain is flowing at peak capacity, the water surface in the system approaches the top of the high flow control. The Vortechs system will be sized large enough so that previously captured pollutants are retained in the system even during these infrequent events.

As a storm subsides, treated runoff decants out of the Vortechs system at a controlled rate, restoring the water level to a dry-weather level equal to the invert of the inlet and outlet pipes. The low water level facilitates easier inspection and cleaning, and significantly reduces maintenance costs by reducing pump-out volume.

Vortechs

- Proven performance speeds approval process
- Treats peak flows without bypassing
- Flow controls reduce inflow velocity and increase residence time
- Unobstructed access simplifies maintenance
- Shallow system profile makes installation easier and less expensive
- Very low headloss
- Flexible design fits multiple site constraints
Patented continuous deflection separation (CDS) technology

Using patented continuous deflective separation technology, the CDS system screens, separates and traps sediment, debris, and oil and grease from stormwater runoff. The indirect screening capability of the system allows for 100% removal of floatables and neutrally buoyant material without blinding. Flow and screening controls physically separate captured solids, and minimize the re-suspension and release of previously trapped pollutants. Available in precast or cast-in-place. Offline units can treat flows from 30 to 8500 L/s (1 to 300 cfs). Inline units can treat up to 170 L/s (7.5 cfs), and internally bypass larger flows in excess of 1420 L/s (50 cfs). The pollutant removal capability of the CDS system has been proven in the lab and field.

How does it work?

Stormwater enters the CDS unit’s diversion chamber where the diversion weir guides the flow into the unit’s separation chamber and pollutants are removed. All flows up to the system’s treatment design capacity enter the separation chamber.

Swirl concentration and screen deflection forces floatables and solids to the center of the separation chamber where 100% of floatables and neutrally buoyant debris larger than the screen apertures are trapped.

Stormwater then moves through the separation screen, under the oil baffle and exits the system. The separation screen remains clog free due to continuous deflection.

During flow events exceeding the design capacity, the diversion weir bypasses excessive flows around the separation chamber, so captured pollutants will not wash out.

CDS

- Removes sediment, trash, and free oil and grease
- Patented screening technology captures and retains 100% of floatables, including neutrally buoyant and all other material larger than the screen aperture
- Operation independent of flow
- Performance verified through lab and field testing
- Unobstructed maintenance access
- Customizable/flexible design and multiple configurations available
- Separates and confines pollutants from outlet flow
- Inline, offline, grate inlet and drop inlet configurations available
- Multiple screen aperture sizes available
Hydrodynamic separation with internal bypass

The VortSentry is a hydrodynamic separator with a small footprint that makes it an effective treatment option for projects where space is at a premium and effective removal of floating and sinking pollutants is critical. The internal bypass ensures treatment chamber velocities remain low, which improves performance and eliminates the risk of resuspension.

In addition to standalone applications, the VortSentry is an ideal pretreatment device. The system is housed inside a concrete manhole structure for easy installation (often without the use of a crane) and unobstructed maintenance access.

How does it work?

Stormwater runoff enters the unit tangentially to promote a gentle swirling motion in the treatment chamber. As stormwater circles within the chamber, settleable solids fall into the sump and are retained. Buoyant debris and oil and grease rise to the surface and are separated from the water as it flows under the baffle wall. Treated water exits the treatment chamber through a flow control orifice located behind the baffle wall.

During low-flow conditions all runoff is diverted into the treatment chamber by the flow partition. At higher flow rates, a portion of the runoff spills over the flow partition and is diverted around the treatment chamber, filling the head equalization chamber. This collapses the head differential between the treatment chamber and the outlet, resulting in a relatively constant flow rate in the treatment chamber even with a substantial increase in total flow through the system. This further reduces the potential for resuspension or washout of captured pollutants.

VortSentry

- Treatment and internal bypass in one structure
- Compact design ideal for congested sites
- Unobstructed maintenance access
- Round, lightweight construction for easy installation
Engineered performance and installation simplicity

The VortSentry HS system employs a helical flow pattern that enhances trapping and containment of pollutants and provides effective removal of settleable solids and floating contaminants from urban runoff.

With the ability to accept a wide range of pipe sizes, the VortSentry HS can treat and convey flows from small to large sites. A unique internal bypass design means higher flows can be diverted without the use of external bypass structures. The design of the VortSentry HS minimizes adverse velocities or turbulence in the treatment chamber. This helps to prevent the washout of previously captured pollutants even during peak conditions.

The VortSentry HS is also available in a grate inlet configuration, which is ideal for retrofits.

How does it work?

Flows from low intensity storms, which are most frequent, are directed into the treatment chamber through the primary inlet. The tangentially oriented downward pipe induces a swirling motion in the treatment chamber that increases capture and containment abilities. Moderate storm flows are directed into the treatment chamber through the secondary inlet, which allows for capture of floating trash and debris. The secondary inlet also provides for treatment of higher flows without significantly increasing the velocity or turbulence in the treatment chamber. This allows for a more quiescent separation environment. Settleable solids and floating pollutants are captured and contained in the treatment chamber.

Flow exits the treatment chamber through the outlet flow control, which manages the amount of flow that is treated and helps maintain the helical flow patterns developed within the treatment chamber.

Flows exceeding the system's rated treatment flow are diverted away from the treatment chamber by the flow partition. Internal diversion of high flows eliminates the need for external bypass structures. During bypass, the head equalizing baffle applies head on the outlet flow control to limit the flow through the treatment chamber. This helps prevent re-suspension of previously captured pollutants.

VortSentry HS

- Helical flow pattern enhances trapping and containment of pollutants
- High treatment and bypass capacities
- Compact footprint ideal for congested sites
- Lightweight design easy to install
- Available in both inline and grate inlet configurations
- Quick manufacturing turnaround time
## Available Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDS Model</th>
<th>Typical Internal MH Diameter or Equivalent ID</th>
<th>Typical Depth Below Pipe Invert</th>
<th>Water Quality Flow</th>
<th>Screen Diameter/Height</th>
<th>Typical Sump Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>125 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS2015-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS2020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS2025</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3020</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3030</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3035</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4030</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4040</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4045</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3020-D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3030-D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3030-D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3035-D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4030-D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4040-D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4045-D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5042-DV</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5042-DV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5050-DV</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5063-D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5068-D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5078-D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5070-DV</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS10060-DV</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS10080-DV</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS100100-DV</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS150134-DC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.7''</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.7''</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS200164-DC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.9''</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.9''</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS240160-DC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.9''</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.6''</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sump Capacities and Depth Below Pipe Invert can vary due to specific site design.**

1. Structure diameter represents the typical inside dimension of the concrete structure. Offline systems will require additional concrete diversion components.

2. Depth Below Pipe and Sump Capacities can vary to accommodate specific site design.

3. Water Quality Flow is based on 80% removal of a particle size distribution (PSD) having a mean particle size: d50 = 125 μm, which is a typical PSD gradation characterizing particulate matter (TS/SSC) in urban rainfall runoff.

### Water Quality Flow, Particle Size & Performance Notes:

- 80% removal (Re=80%) performance forecasts of the PSD having a d50 = 125 μm is derived from controlled tests of a unit equipped with 2400-μm screen. Performance forecasts for specific particle size gradations or d50s = 50, 75, 125, 150 & 200-μm are also available. Removal forecasts based on unit evaluations conducted in accordance with the Technology Assessment Protocol - Ecology (TAPE) protocols, Washington Department of Ecology (WASDOE).

- Units can be sized to achieve specific flow performance for peak flow rates for specific Water Quality Flows, over the hydrograph of a Water Quality Storm Event sized to meet a specific removal on an average basis using accepted probabilistic methods. When sizing based on a specific water quality flow rate, the required flow to be treated should be equal to or less than the listed water quality flow for the selected system. Contact our support staff for the most cost effective sizing for your area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vortechs Model</th>
<th>Swirl Chamber Diameter (ft)</th>
<th>Internal Length (m)</th>
<th>Water Quality Flow&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; 100 µm (cfs/L/s)</th>
<th>Peak Treatment Flow&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (cfs)</th>
<th>Sediment Storage (yd&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.21/5.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.36/10.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.59/16.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.78/23.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.1/31.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4/39.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.8/51.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3/65.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.3/93.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Water Quality Flow Rates are based on 80% removal for the particle size distributions (PSD) listed above with d<sub>50</sub> = 50, 110 & 200-µm. Particle size should be chosen based on anticipated sediment load.

2. Peak Treatment Flow is maximum flow treated for each unit listed. This flow represents an infrequent storm event such as a 10 or 25 yr storm.

Standard Vortechs System depth below invert is 3" for all precast models.

Cast-in-place system are available to treat higher flows. Check with your local representatives for specifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VortSentry Model</th>
<th>Swirl Chamber Diameter (ft)</th>
<th>Typical Depth Below Invert (m)</th>
<th>Water Quality Flow&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; 110 µm (cfs/L/s)</th>
<th>Max. Size Inlet/Outlet (in/mm)</th>
<th>Sediment Storage (yd&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VS30*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.8/1.8</td>
<td>12/300</td>
<td>0.8/0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.0/2.1</td>
<td>18/460</td>
<td>1.4/1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS50*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.0/2.4</td>
<td>18/460</td>
<td>2.2/1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.9/2.7</td>
<td>24/600</td>
<td>3.1/2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS70*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.7/3.0</td>
<td>36/750</td>
<td>4.3/3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.1/3.1</td>
<td>36/600</td>
<td>5.6/4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes models may not be manufactured in your area. Check with your local representative for availability.

1. Water Quality Flow is based on 80% removal of a particle size distribution with an average particle size of 110 µm. This flow also represents the maximum flow prior to which bypass occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VortSentry HS Model</th>
<th>Swirl Chamber Diameter (ft)</th>
<th>Typical Depth Below Invert (m)</th>
<th>Water Quality Flow&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; 240 µm (cfs/L/s)</th>
<th>Max. Size Inlet/Outlet (in/mm)</th>
<th>Sediment Storage (yd&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS36*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.6/1.7</td>
<td>18/460</td>
<td>0.5/0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.8/2.1</td>
<td>24/600</td>
<td>0.9/0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS60*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.0/2.4</td>
<td>30/760</td>
<td>1.5/1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.2/2.8</td>
<td>36/900</td>
<td>2.1/1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS84*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.4/3.7</td>
<td>42/1050</td>
<td>2.8/2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>11.5/3.5</td>
<td>48/1200</td>
<td>3.7/2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Models may not be manufactured in your area. Check with your local representative for availability.

1. Water Quality Flow is based on 80% removal of a particle size distribution with an average particle size of 240 µm. This flow also represents the maximum flow prior to which bypass occurs.

Notes:
- Systems can be sized based on a water quality flow (e.g., 1 inch storm) or on a net annual basis depending on the local regulatory requirement.
- When sizing based on a water quality storm, the required flow to be treated should be equal or less than the listed water quality flow for the selected system.
- Systems sized based on a water quality storm are generally more conservatively sized.
- Additional particle size distributions are available for sizing purposes upon request.
- Depth below invert is measured to the inside bottom of the system. This depth can be adjusted to meet specific storage or maintenance requirements.
- Contact our support staff for the most cost effective sizing for your area.
Customer Support

Installation
CONTECH Stormwater Solutions’ products are some of the easiest to install in the industry. We provide comprehensive installation drawings, details and instructions, as well as full technical support on every project.

Maintenance
Maintenance of CONTECH Stormwater Solutions products is cost effective, straightforward and efficient. We offer a complete range of engineering planning, design and drawing, and construction services that can be tailored to your specific site needs.

Support
• Drawings and specifications are available at contechstormwater.com.
• Site-specific design support is available from our professional engineering staff engineers.

©2008 CONTECH Construction Products
CONTECH Construction Products Inc is your single source for hassle-free specifying and purchasing of comprehensive site solutions. CONTECH’s portfolio includes bridges, drainage, erosion control, retaining wall, sanitary sewer, soil stabilization and stormwater solutions.
Nothing in this catalog should be construed as an expressed warranty or an implied warranty of merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose. See the CONTECH standard quotation or acknowledgement for applicable warranties and other terms and conditions of sale.
The product(s) described may be protected by one or more patents:
6,408,218; 6,641,721
Vortechs, Vort Sentry, Vort Sentry HS, and CDS are trademarks, registered trademarks, or licensed trademarks of CONTECH Construction Products Inc.
Mr. Wayne Hedani, Chair
and Members of the Maui Planning Commission
200 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Chair Hedani and Members:

SUBJECT: URBAN DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (UDRB) COMMENTS FOR
THE PROPOSED LAHAINA MCDONALD’S RESTAURANT
RECONSTRUCTION AND RELATED IMPROVEMENTS,
LOCATED IN LAHAINA, MAUI, HAWAII; TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019
(SM1 2009/0008) (EA 2009/0004)

At a regular meeting held on August 4, 2009, the UDRB reviewed the above-referenced project, and provided the following comments and recommendations for inclusion into the review of the Special Management Area (SMA) application:

1. Review the availability and use of high-performance, energy-efficient "true mullioned" windows for inclusion into the building design;

2. Investigate the use of additional landscaping and possible inclusion of canopy trees to screen the adjacent building wall along the double-drive through aisle on the west side of the project;

3. Use period lighting pole lights for as much of the project site as possible, and especially in perimeter locations along Papalaua Street and Wainee Street, and in the parking area. Limit the lighting pole height to a maximum of fifteen-feet (15’), e.g., a twelve-feet (12’) pole atop a three-feet (3’) base; and

4. Provide proper and design appropriate screening for any propane gas tank if such a tank is to be included on-site.

Please provide written responses to the above comments for inclusion into the SMA report to the Maui Planning Commission.
Mr. Wayne Hedani, Chair  
and Members of the Maui Planning Commission  
August 11, 2009  
Page 2

Thank you for your cooperation. Should you require further clarification, please contact Staff Planner Kurt Wollenhaupt by email at kurt.wollenhaupt@mauicounty.gov or at 270-1789.

Sincerely

[Signature]

ANTHONY RIECKE GONZALES, AIA, Chair  
Maui County Urban Design Review Board

xc:  Clayton I. Yoshida, AICP, Planning Program Administrator  
Kurt F. Wollenhaupt, Staff Planner  
Kimberly Skog, Planner, Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.  
EA Project File  
SM1 Project File  
General File

JSH-KFW.vb  
k:\wp_docs\planningsm1\2009\0008_lahainamcdonalds\udrbcommentsltr.doc
July 6, 2009

Ms. Kimberly Skog  
Planner  
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, HI 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina (SM1 2009/0008) (EA 2009/0004)

Thank you for your letter of June 19, 2009, requesting comments on the above subject.

We have reviewed the information submitted and have no comments or recommendations to make at this time. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on this project. We are returning the application that was submitted for our review.

Very truly yours,

Assistant Chief Wayne T. Ribao  
for: Gary A. Yabuta  
Chief of Police

c: Jeffrey Hunt, Planning Department
Ms. Kimberly Skog  
MUNEKIYO & HIRAGA, INC.  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii 96793  

Dear Ms. Skog:

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS FOR PROPOSED LAHAINA MCDONALD'S RESTAURANT RECONSTRUCTION; TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019  
SM1 2009/0008; EA 2009/0004

We reviewed the subject application and have the following comments:

1. The applicant shall be responsible for all required improvements as required by Hawaii Revised Statutes, Maui County Code and rules and regulations.

2. As applicable, construction plans shall be designed in conformance with Hawaii Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction dated 2005 and Standard Details for Public Works Construction, 1984, as amended.


4. West Maui Community Plan identifies Wainee Street as a local road, however, it is classified as a major collector on the Statewide Functional Classification list. Therefore, the standard right of way for a road of this status is 60 feet. If the standard on the West Maui Community Plan is upheld, the right of way would be 44 feet.
5. Landscaping along the street frontage shall be provided with root barriers.

6. The plans submitted for this project do not adequately show sufficient detail to determine whether the project is compliant with building codes. We will review the project for Building Code requirements during the building permit application process.

Please call Michael Miyamoto at 270-7845 if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

MILTON M. ARAKAWA, A.I.C.P.
Director of Public Works

MMA:MMM:ls
xc: Highways Division
    Engineering Division
S:\LUCA\CZM\Lahaina_McDonalds_Rest_Recon_dea_sma_45001019.ls.wpd
Milton Arakawa, Director  
**Department of Public Works**  
County of Maui  
200 South High Street, Room 434  
Wailuku, Maui, Hawai‘i 96793  

**SUBJECT:** Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction; TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i (SM1 2009/0008 and EA 2009/0004)

Dear Mr. Arakawa:

Thank you for your letter dated July 14, 2009, regarding the proposed reconstruction of the McDonald’s restaurant in Lahaina. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., we offer the following in response to your comments:

**Comment No. 1:**

The applicant shall be responsible for all required improvements as required by Hawai‘i Revised Statutes, Maui County Code and rules and regulations.

**Response:** The applicant acknowledges its responsibility in providing required improvements in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

**Comment No. 2:**

As applicable, construction plans shall be designed in conformance with Hawai‘i Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction dated 2005 and Standard details for Public Works Construction, 1984, as amended.

**Response:** Construction activity is not being proposed within Wainee Street or Papalaua Street. As such, the above specifications and details are not applicable. Should any improvements be constructed with Wainee or Papalaua Streets, the specifications and details will be referenced.
Comment No. 3:


Response: Construction activity is not being proposed within Wainee Street or Papalaua Street. As such, the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devises for Streets and Highways (MUTCD) is not applicable. Should any improvements be constructed with Wainee or Papalaua Streets, the MUTCD will be referenced and if required, traffic-control plans will be developed for the proposed construction activity in the roadway.

Comment No. 4:

West Maui Community Plan identifies Wainee Street as a local road, however, it is classified as a major collector on the Statewide Functional Classification list. Therefore, the standard right of way for a road of this status is 60 feet. If the standard on the West Maui Community Plan is upheld, the right of way would be 44 feet.

Response: McDonald's has previously contributed to the widening effort of Wainee Street to the proposed 60 feet right-of-way. As one of the conditions for the construction of the Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant in 1981, the County of Maui required McDonald's to construct roadway improvements along Wainee Street. In this regard, the County required the land owner to subdivide and dedicate to the County, an 8-foot-wide parcel of land along the Wainee Street frontage. A copy of the agreement and a print of the roadway improvements is attached. See Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B".

Comment No. 5:

Landscaping along the street frontage shall be provided with root barriers.

Response: The preliminary landscaping plan prescribes root barriers along the street frontage.
Comment No. 6

The plans submitted for this project do not adequately show sufficient detail to determine whether the project is compliant with building codes. We will review the project for Building Code requirements during the building permit application process.

Response: At the time of the building permit application, plans submitted will be of sufficient detail to comply with the building code.

Again, thank you for your comments. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 244-2015 or email kimberly@mhpplanning.com

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
Enclosures
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
    Kurt Wollenhaupt, Department of Planning
    Conrad Shiroma, Kim & Shiroma Engineers, Inc.
WARRANTY DEED

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS:

THIS INDENTURE made and entered into on this 64th day of July, 1983, by and between TENRIKYO MAUI KYOKAI, a Hawaii eleemosynary corporation, hereinafter called the "Grantor", and the COUNTY OF MAUI, a political subdivision of the State of Hawaii, whose mailing address is 200 South High Street, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii, hereinafter called the "Grantee",

WITNESSETH:

That the Grantor, for valuable consideration to it paid by the Grantee, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, does hereby give, grant, bargain, sell and convey the real property described in Exhibit A attached hereto and expressly made a part hereof unto the Grantee, its successors and assigns, forever, as Tenant in Severyalty.

AND the reversions, remainders, rents, issues and profits thereof, and all of the estate, right, title and

EXHIBIT "B"
interest of the Grantor, both at law and in equity, there-
in and thereto.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the same, together with all
buildings, improvements, rights, easements, privileges and
appurtenances thereunto belonging or appertaining or hold
and enjoyed therewith, unto the Grantee as aforesaid,
forever.

AND the Grantor does hereby covenant and agree
with the Grantee that the Grantor is lawfully seized in
fee simple of the granted property and has good right to
give, grant, bargain, sell and convey the same as aforesaid;
that said property is free and clear of all encum-
brances, except non-delinquent real property taxes, and
except as set forth in said Exhibit A; and that the
Grantor will WARRANT AND DEFEND the same unto the Grantee
against the lawful claims and demands of all persons whom-
soever.

AND, for valuable consideration, the receipt of
which is hereby acknowledged by the Grantee, McDONALD'S OF
HAWAII DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, a Hawaii limited partnership,
the lessee named in that certain Indenture of Lease dated
December 19, 1978, from the Grantor herein, a short form
of which is recorded in the Bureau of Conveyances of the
State of Hawaii in Liber 13407, Page 92, and the holder of
an option to purchase the Grantor's fee simple interest in
the real property described in said Indenture of Lease,
which includes the real property described in said Exhibit
A, does hereby release and quitclaim unto the Grantee all
of its right, title and interest in and to the real property described in said Exhibit A and does hereby covenant
and with the Grantee that no encumbrances have been
made or suffered by it with respect to said real property,
except for the lien of real property taxes not yet by law
required to be paid.

The terms "Grantor" and "Grantee", as and when
used herein, or any pronouns used in place thereof, shall
mean and include the masculine or feminine, the singular
or plural number, individuals or corporation and their and
each of their respective successors, heirs, personal
representatives and assigns, according to the context
thereof. If these presents shall be signed by two or more
Grantors or by two or more Grantees, all covenants of such
parties shall for all purposes be joint and several.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Grantor and Lessee have
hereunto executed these presents on the day and year first
above written.

TENRIKYO MAUI KYOKAI

By __________________________
   Its President

By __________________________
   Its Treasurer

"Grantor"

McDONALD'S OF HAWAII DEVELOPMENT
COMPANY, a Hawaii limited partnership

By __________________________
   Maurice J. Sullivan
   Its General Partner

"Lessee"
STATE OF HAWAII       ss.
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

On this 6th day of July, 1983, before me appeared HAJICHI OKUMA and MARY WAGANA, to me personally known, who being by me duly sworn did say that they are the President and Treasurer, respectively, of TENRIKYO MAUI KYOKAI, a Hawaii eleemosynary corporation, and that the seal affixed to the foregoing instrument is the corporate seal of said corporation and that said instrument was signed and sealed in behalf of said corporation by authority of its Board of Directors and the said officers acknowledged said instrument to be the free act and deed of said corporation.

[Signature]
Notary Public, State of Hawaii

My Commission Expires: 1/1/75

STATE OF HAWAII       ss.
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

On this 12th day of July, 1983, before me appeared MAURICE J. SULLIVAN, to me personally known, who being by me duly sworn did say that he is the General Partner of MCDONALD'S OF HAWAII DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, a Hawaii limited partnership, and that said instrument was signed and sealed in behalf of said partnership and said MAURICE J. SULLIVAN acknowledged said instrument to be the free act and deed of said partnership.

[Signature]
Notary Public, State of Hawaii

My Commission Expires: 9/18/86
EXHIBIT A

Land situated on the southwesterly side of Wainee Street and the southeasterly side of Papalaua Street at Aki, Kuhua, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii

Being portions of R.P. 1179, L.C. Aw. 312 Apana 2 to T. Keawe'Iwi and R.P. 1176, L.C. Aw. 487 to Kaailau

Beginning at a new 3/4-inch pipe at the most southerly corner of this lot, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "LAINA", being 6,622.28 feet South and 3,756.39 feet West and running by azimuths measured clockwise from True South:

1. 146° 09' 30" 110.93 feet along the remainder of R.P. 1176, L.C. Aw. 487 to Kaailau (Lot 1 of McDonald's of Hawaii Development Co. Subdivision) to a new 3/4-inch pipe;

2. Thence along the remainders of R.P. 1176, L.C. Aw. 487 to Kaailau and R.P. 1179, L.C. Aw. 312 Apana 2 to Keawe'Iwi (Lot 1 of McDonald's of Hawaii Development Co. Subdivision) on a curve to the left having a radius of 30.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being 101° 49' 51" 41.93 feet to a new 3/4-inch pipe;

3. 237° 30' 12" 17.77 feet along the southeasterly side of Papalaua Street to a found 1/2-inch pipe;

4. Thence along the southerly side of Papalaua Street and Wainee Street intersection on a curve to the right having a radius of 20.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being 281° 49' 51" 27.95 feet to a found 1/2-inch pipe;

5. 326° 09' 30" 120.70 feet along the southwesterly side of Wainee Street to a found 1/2-inch pipe;

6. 57° 30' 35" 8.00 feet along a portion of R.P. 4475, L.C. Aw. 7713 Apana 25 to Kamalual to the point of beginning and containing an Area of 1,223 square feet.

BEING a portion of the premises conveyed to the Grantor herein by Deed dated September 29, 1961, recorded in the Bureau of Conveyances of the State of Hawaii in Liber 4173 at Page 119.
Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner  
MUNEKIYO & HIRAGA, INC.  
305 High Street, Suite 104  
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii 96793

Dear Ms. Skog:

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA USE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE PROPOSED LAHAINA MCDONALD'S RESTAURANT RECONSTRUCTION; 885 WAINEE STREET, LAHAINA, MAUI, HAWAII; TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019

We reviewed your responses to the comment letter dated July 14, 2009 and have the following comment:

1. Frontage improvements may be triggered by valuation of building renovations.

Please call Michael Miyamoto at 270-7845 if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

MILTON M. ARAKAWA, A.I.C.P.  
Director of Public Works
COUNTY OF MAUI
DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT
2200 MAIN STREET, SUITE 100
WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793

August 4, 2009

Ms. Kimberly Skog
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

SUBJECT: LAHAINA MCDONALD'S RESTAURANT RECONSTRUCTION
SM1 2009/0008 AND EA2009/0004
TMK (2) 4-6-018:012 (POR.), LAHAINA

We reviewed the subject application and have the following comments:

1. Solid Waste Division comments:
   a. None.

2. Wastewater Reclamation Division (WWRD) comments:
   a. Although wastewater system capacity is currently available as of 8/4/2009, the developer should be informed that wastewater system capacity cannot be ensured until the issuance of the building permit.
   b. Developer is not required to pay assessment fees for this area at the current time.
   c. Developer is required to fund any necessary off-site improvements to collection system and wastewater pump stations.
   d. Plans shall show the existing property sewer service manhole near the property line. If a property sewer service manhole does not exist, one shall be installed.
   e. Commercial kitchen facilities within the proposed project shall comply with pre-treatment requirements (including grease interceptors, sample boxes, screens etc.)
   f. Non-contact cooling water and condensate should not drain to the wastewater system.
If you have any questions regarding this memorandum, please contact Gregg Kresge at 270-8230.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Cheryl K. Okuma, Director
Cheryl Okuma, Director
County of Maui
Department of Environmental Management
2200 Main Street, Suite 100
Wailuku, Hawai`i 96793

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for the Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction; TMK (2) 4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai`i (SM1 2009/0008 and EA 2009/0004)

Dear Ms. Okuma:

Thank you for your letter dated August 4, 2009, providing comments on the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., the following comments are offered in response to your remarks:

1. **Solid Waste Division Comments:**

   a. The applicant notes that the Solid Waste Division offers no comments.

2. **Wastewater Reclamation Division Comments:**

   a. The proposed action involves the reconstruction of an existing restaurant, as such, the applicant notes that wastewater system capacity requirements will not increase over current levels.

   b. The applicant concurs that assessment fees are not required at this time.

   c. As discussed in Item No. 2.a. above, wastewater system requirements will not increase as a result of the proposed action, therefore, off-site improvements to collection system and wastewater pump stations are not anticipated.

   d. Please refer to Exhibit 1 which depicts the location of the existing sewer service lateral. Because a property sewer manhole does not exist at this
time, the applicant's civil engineer will ensure a manhole is installed, per code requirements.

e. As a standard feature of McDonald's restaurants, the existing restaurant contains a grease interceptor. The proposed project will retain the existing grease interceptor, thereby maintaining compliance with applicable pretreatment requirements.

f. McDonald's restaurants do not utilize equipment cooled by non-contact cooling. Condensate from the air-conditioning system is received by dry wells and does not drain to the wastewater system.

Your input on the proposed action is greatly appreciated. Should you require additional information, or should any questions arise in regards to the subject project, please feel free to contact me at (808) 244-2015 or email kim@mhplanning.com.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

KS:yp
Enclosure
cc: Mike Yamamoto, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
    Conrad Shiroma, Kim & Shiroma Engineers, Inc.
    Kurt Wollenhaupt, Department of Planning
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
COUNTY OF MAUI
200 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii, USA 96793-2155

July 13, 2009

Ms. Kimberly Skog
Munekiyo & Hiraga Inc.
305 High Street, Suite 104
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii 96793

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for Proposed Reconstruction of McDonalds Restaurant located in Lahaina

Dear Ms. Skog,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. We have no comments to make at this time.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Don Medeiros
Director
July 23, 2009

Mr. Kurt Wollenhaupt, Staff Planner  
Planning Department  
County of Maui  
250 S High Street  
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Project Name: Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction  
I.D.: SM1 2009/0008 & EA2009/0004  
TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019

Dear Mr. Wollenhaupt:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this application. We note that our response letter to the EA early consultation dated December 31, 2008 is included in the application document. We have no objections to the approval of the SM1 but provide additional recommendations for conservation and pollution prevention.

The project site is within 670 feet of the coastal waters. In order to protect surface and groundwater resources, we recommend that the applicant take precautionary measures during demolition as well as construction to prevent construction materials, debris and eroded soils from entering coastal waters. Such measures include:

1. Prevent cement products, oil, fuel and other toxic substances from falling or leaching into the ground or entering storm drains by using proper containment and maintenance practices.
   a. Place storm drain covers or a similarly effective containment device on all nearby drains to prevent dirty runoff and loose particles from entering the storm drainage system. Place covers at the beginning of the work day and remove accumulated materials before removing the covers at the end of the work day. If storm drains are not present, dikes, berms or other methods must be used to protect overland discharge paths off runoff.
   b. Sweep street gutters, sidewalks, driveways, and other paved surfaces in the immediate area of the demolition at the end of each work day to collect and properly dispose of loose debris and garbage.
   c. Maintain vehicles and equipment to prevent leakage of oil or other fluids.

"By Water All Things Find Life"
Proposed McDonald Restaurant Reconstruction

2. Properly and promptly dispose of all loosened and excavated soil and debris material from drainage structure work.

3. Keep run-off on site.
   a. Construct drainage control features, such as berms, install silting basins where warranted.
   b. Maintain drainage structures, detention, silting and debris basins.

4. Limit construction to dry periods.

5. Avoid fertilizers and biocides, or apply only during periods of low rainfall to minimize chemical run-off.

6. Control dust by proper stockpiling and use non-potable water for dust control.

Below is a list of BMPs to ensure that pollutants from restaurant operations do not enter or leach into the ground:

1. Handling Oils and Grease:
   a. Use grease traps or interceptors and clean them regularly. Keep a log on site cleaning dates for these products.
   b. Never pour grease down the sink drain, floor drain, storm drain, or toilet. Save used oil in sealed container for recycling
   c. Have a disposal receptacle on-site for grease only and inform employees of the importance of keeping this separate from the dumpster and other restaurant waste.
   d. Scrape food waste off of utensils, plates, pots and pans and dispose of in the garbage before cleaning. Always wash kitchen mats, garbage containers, grills and utensils over an area that is connected to the sewer system
   e. For grease spills use dry methods for clean-up. Disposable rags or an absorbent material such as cat litter can be used to pick up grease.

2. Housekeeping
   Buy the least toxic cleaning products available. Look for products that are phosphate-free, non-toxic, biodegradable, and/or free of ammonia, dyes and perfumes.

Conservation
In order to further conserve water, we recommend the following measures:


2. Single-pass, water-cooled systems should be eliminated per Maui County Code Subsection 14.21.20. Although prohibited by code, single-pass water cooling is still manufactured into some models of air conditioners, freezers, and commercial refrigerators. Avoid water-cooled ice machines. Specify efficient air-cooled ice-machines.

3. Ware washing units should have flow rates of less than 1 gallon per rack.

4. Pre-rinse spray valves on dishwashers should have a flow rate equal to or less than 1.6 gpm at 60 psi. Check for EPA WaterSense labeled water fixtures.
5. Automated irrigation systems should be equipped with rain shut-off devices and/or SMART controllers capable of responding to moisture conditions. If multiple hydro zones and irrigation circuits are planned, controllers should be capable of multiple programming.
6. Utilize efficient irrigation emitters.
7. Ensure that all hose bibs are equipped with self-closing nozzles.
8. Aim to meet irrigation needs with watering no more than 2 days per week. Schedule irrigation between 7 PM and 10 AM.
9. Irrigation systems should be installed, operated and maintained to prevent run-off, overspray or low-head-drainage.
10. Check and maintain irrigation systems regularly. Repair leaks promptly.

Should you have any questions, please call our Water Resources and Planning Division at 244-8550

Sincerely,

Jeffrey K. Eng
Director

eam
c: engineering division
   Kimberly Skog, Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
Jeffrey K. Eng, Director  
County of Maui  
**Department of Water Supply**  
200 South High Street  
Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793

**SUBJECT:** Proposed Lahaina McDonald’s Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2)  
4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i (SM1 2009/0008 and EA 2009/0004)

Dear Mr. Eng:

Thank you for your letter dated July 23, 2009, providing comments on the early consultation request for the subject project. On behalf of the applicant, McDonald’s Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc., the following comments are offered in response to your remarks:

1. The applicant recognizes the importance of protecting surface, water, groundwater, and ocean water resources during demolition and construction. In this respect, precautionary measures, such as those suggested, will be taken to prevent soil, debris, and construction materials from entering into the storm drainage system and coastal waters.

2. It is standard practice for McDonald’s restaurants to operate in accordance with Best Management Practices (BMPs) for restaurant operations. The applicant also notes that a grease interceptor is currently in existence onsite, and this grease interceptor will be maintained with the reconstructed restaurant.

3. With regard to water conservation, low-flow water fixtures and devices are standard fittings in McDonald’s restaurants, and McDonald’s restaurants do not utilize equipment that is cooled by single-pass, water-cooled systems. In addition, the primary landscaping plans prescribe the utilization of plants which are suited to a relatively dry environment, as well as the installation of a drip irrigation system.
Your input on the proposed action is greatly appreciated. Should you require additional information, or should any questions arise in regards to the subject project, please feel free to contact me at (808) 244-2015 or email kim@mhplanning.com.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog, Planner

cc: Kurt Wollenhaupt, County of Maui, Department of Planning
    Mike Yamamoto, McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
    Kevin Tanaka, Landscape Architect
June 25, 2009

Ms. Kimberly Skog, Planner
Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc.
305 High St. Suite 104
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction (SM1 2009/0008 and EA 2009/0004)
Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii
TMK: (2) 4-5-001:019

Dear Ms. Skog,

Thank you for allowing us to comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment and Special Management Area Use Permit Application for the subject project.

In reviewing our records and the information received, Maui Electric Company (MECO) has no additional comments to the subject project at this time.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please call me at 871-2340.

Sincerely,

Ray Okazaki
Staff Engineer
Leilani Pulmano, Executive Director  
Lahaina Bypass Now  
505 Front Street, Suite 202  
Lahaina, Hawai‘i 96761

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Application for Proposed Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction at TMK (2)4-5-001:019, Lahaina, Maui, Hawai‘i (SM1 2009/0008) (EA 2009/0004)

Dear Ms. Pulmano:

Please find enclosed a letter from the County of Maui, Department of Planning requesting concurrent review of the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit application for the subject action. Please note that the deadline for receipt of comments is July 23, 2009.

On behalf of the County of Maui, Department of Planning, we would like to thank you for your participation in this consolidated review process.

Very truly yours,

Kimberly Skog  
Planner

KS:yp  
Enclosures  
cc: Kurt Wollenhaupt, Department of Planning (w/out enclosures)  
Mike Yamamoto, McDonald's Restaurant of Hawaii, Inc. (w/out enclosures)

305 High Street, Suite 104 * Wailuku, Hawaii 96793 * ph: (808)244-2015 * fax: (808)244-8729 * planning@mhsplanning.com / www.mhsplanning.com
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APPENDIX A.

Drainage Letter Report
January 9, 2009

McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 2000
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Mr. Kelley Nakano

Subject: McDonalds - Lahaina
885 Wainee Street
Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii
TMK (2)-4-5-01:19

Gentlemen:

We are providing this letter to address drainage concerns that may be brought up during the processing of the SMA application. The project involves the demolition of an existing McDonald's Restaurant building and construction of a new restaurant building that will include drive-thru and parking area reconstruction.

The ground at the site varies from a low elevation of about 14.9 on west corner of the property on Papalaua Street up to 16.3 at the intersection of Papalaua Street and Wainee Street down to 16.0 at the east corner of the property on Wainee Street. The existing restaurant floor elevation is 17.0.

The proposed restaurant building will have a finish floor elevation very close to the existing restaurant finish floor. Grades around the building will slope away from the new building and will not vary substantially from the existing grades.

There are two drain inlets on site that receive storm runoff from the site. The existing landscaped areas along Papalaua Street and Wainee Street do not flow toward the drain inlets but are directed to the County roadways. This drainage pattern will be maintained with the design and construction of the new building.

We have reviewed the approved new building and site layout and have compared existing and proposed hard surface areas and landscaped areas. The areas are summarized below:
SUMMARY OF LAND USE - TMK (2)4-5-001:019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscaped</td>
<td>4,526 sf</td>
<td>5,368 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Surface (paved, Bldg)</td>
<td>17,810 sf</td>
<td>16,988 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LAND AREA</td>
<td>22,336 sf</td>
<td>22,336 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary indicates that the landscaped area will increase by 842 sf. The comparison of storm runoff between the existing and proposed conditions shows a decrease in runoff of 0.07 cfs from 1.93 cfs to 1.86 cfs.

If there are any questions regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to call me or email me at cshiroma@cka.com.

Very truly yours,

KIM & SHIROMA ENGINEERS, INC.

By:  
Conrad T. Shiroma, P.E.  
President
PROPOSED RUNOFF

L = 240 Ft
S = 0.70 %
Tm = 10 Years
1-Hr Rainfall = 2.0 Inch
Tc = 6.5 Minutes
I = 4.8 In/Hr
C = 0.76
A = 0.51 Ac
Q = 1.86 CFS

PROPOSED RUNOFF MAP

SCALE: 1" = 40'

McDONALD'S - LAHAINA
TMK (2)-4-5-01:19

Description:
Proposed Drainage Condition
APPENDIX A-1.

Supplemental Drainage Letter Report
March 26, 2010

McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 2000
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Mr. Mike Yamamoto

SUBJECT: Lahaina McDonald's Restaurant Reconstruction
885 Wainee Street
Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii
TMK (2) 4-5-001:019

Gentlemen:

The County of Maui, Department of Planning, in their letter dated July 21, 2009, indicated that McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii should "Review proposed drainage plan to determine feasibility and potential measures to retain all storm water runoff on-site or to significantly increase the amount of runoff retained on-site. Investigate the use of pervious surfaces, on-site retention areas, and other means of reducing off-site water runoff."

In response to the comment, we have reviewed the feasibility and potential measures to increase the amount of storm water runoff retained onsite. Before examining these alternatives, we provide the following overview of the drainage system currently proposed.

I. DRAINAGE SYSTEM OVERVIEW AND ENGINEERING CONSIDERATIONS

The current runoff volume from the project site is 1.93 cubic feet per second (cfs). The reconstruction of the restaurant will result in a decrease in storm water runoff due to the proposed increase in landscaped areas. The landscaped area will increase from 4,526 square feet (sf) to 5,368 sf. The resulting decrease in storm water runoff from a 10-year storm is 0.07 cfs, yielding a post-development runoff volume of 1.86 cfs. Runoff from the site currently flows to a 36 inch drain line in Papalaua Street

Modifications to the existing drainage system for the project calls for the installation of a hydrodynamic separator (Vortsenry or CDS) at the downstream drain inlet prior to flow from the site entering the County's drainage system. The hydrodynamic separator will remove oils and related petroleum pollutants as well as 80 percent of the total suspended solids (TSS) up to the 100 micron particle size that may be contained in the storm water runoff from the paved areas. Information for the hydrodynamic separators is enclosed hereto as Exhibit "A". The proposed drainage solution is in keeping with the County of Maui's drainage regulations.
We have reviewed the soils report by Hirata & Associates, Inc., dated August 6, 2007. Their investigation indicated the presence of firm to medium stiff clayey silt to depths of 7 feet along Wainee Street, down to 12 feet along the makai boundary below the existing pavement.

The report recommended that the onsite clayey silt subgrade for the slab-on-grade areas be scarified to a minimum depth of 12 inches, moisture conditioned to slightly above the optimum moisture content, and compacted to a minimum 90 percent compaction as determined by ASTM D1557.

The clayey silt material appears to be slightly expansive or clayed in nature, as the soils report requires the subgrade material be moisture conditioned to above optimum moisture content prior to compaction. In lay terms, the soil characteristics at the property are characterized as very slow draining, a condition which must be considered in the engineering analysis for drainage improvements.

II. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

A. Utilize Landscaped Areas for Added Retention

1. Design Concept: The use of the landscaped areas for storm water retention was reviewed. A 12-inch thick gravel layer would be placed in the landscaped areas along Papalaua Street and Wainee Street. Together, these landscaped areas total about 1,275 s.f. with a total storage volume of 425 cf.

Based on a 10-year storm with a runoff rate of 1.86 cfs, this 425 cf storage volume will be filled in approximately four (4) minutes with the runoff from the McDonald’s site. Any additional runoff generated from the McDonald’s site will be discharged into the Papalaua Street drainage system.

Runoff stored in the landscaped areas will percolate into the ground. As noted above, percolation into the clayey silt subgrade will be very slow due to the nature of the subgrade material.

2. Analysis: This concept is not considered practical given the high content clay subsoil which will limit percolation and result in overflow of unfiltered storm water into the Papalaua Street drainline. Additionally, consultation with the landscape architect confirmed that prolonged introduction of oil and petroleum substances into the landscaped areas will result in the need to
B. Utilize Pervious Concrete Pavement

1. **Design Concept:** Pervious concrete pavement was reviewed for use for storm water retention in the onsite paved areas. Based upon the recommendations from the soils consultant, the only suitable area available for storm water retention/detention would be the parking area between the new building and Papalaua Street. Due to the high volume of traffic anticipated from customers, heavy weight trash trucks and delivery vehicles, the entry driveway from Papalaua Street and the double drive-thru area was excluded.

The area proposed for pervious paving encompasses approximately 3,733 s.f. A pervious concrete pavement thickness of 6 inches and a base course thickness of 6 inches will provide about 1,245 cf. of storage volume. A concrete curb will be required on all four (4) sides of the paved area and should extend about 6 inches into the subgrade. The pervious pavement system will be separated from the subgrade with a layer of geotextile fabric. This fabric will prevent the infiltration of the subgrade material into the base course layer.

Based on a 10-year storm with a runoff rate of 1.86 cfs, the 1,245-cf storage volume will be filled in approximately 12 minutes with runoff from the McDonald’s site. Any additional runoff generated from the McDonald’s site will be discharged into the Papalaua Street drainage system.

2. **Analysis:** Once the storm has passed, the runoff caught in the pervious concrete pavement will percolate into the subgrade or evaporate. Percolation of the storm water into the subgrade will be very slow due to the clayey silt material at the subgrade. Due to the low porosity of the subgrade material, the pervious concrete pavement will be exposed to prolonged wet cycles which may cause an early failure to the pavement, due to softening of the subgrade. In addition, degradation in the pavement design may render the drainage function less effective than called for by design. As with the landscaped area design
concept described above, excess water not accommodated by the pervious concrete will flow unfiltered into the Papalaua Street drainline. The pervious concrete pavement will require constant maintenance that will include vacuuming to remove silts and other debris that can clog the openings in the concrete pavement.

C. Install Underground Water Chamber

1. **Design Concept:** A second storm water retention system, which involves the storing of storm water runoff in underground chambers, was also reviewed.

   These underground chambers are made of high density polyethylene and measure 8.5 ft. long x 5 ft. wide and 34 inches high; 42 chambers are proposed to be placed in the parking area. A hydrodynamic separator will be required to remove trash, silts and other objects from the drainage system before the runoff can enter the chamber system.

   The chamber system is to be surrounded by crushed aggregate, and requires a 6-inch layer of this material above and below the chamber system. The top of the chamber needs to be buried a minimum of 2 feet below grade.

   Each chamber can store 75 cf of water, and additional water can be stored within the surrounding aggregate. It is estimated that the total storage volume would be 4,725 cf.

   Based on a 10-year storm with a runoff rate of 1.86 cfs, this 4,725-cf storage volume will be filled in approximately 42 minutes with the runoff from the McDonald’s site. Any additional runoff generated from the McDonald’s site will be discharged into the Papalaua Street drainage system.

   Runoff stored in the chamber system will have to percolate into the ground. As noted above, percolation into the clayey silt subgrade will be very slow due to the nature of the subgrade material.

2. **Analysis:** This alternative is workable with an additional construction cost of $80,000.00. This added cost reflects an estimated increase in project cost of 6.7 percent over the initial bid estimate of $1.2 million. Therefore, a business decision will
be required to determine whether this option is feasible in the context of the project's overall programmed budget.

III. RECOMMENDATION

Engineering analysis and recommendations are based on thorough review of technical data affecting the elements of design, the overall objective of the design, and cost-benefit parameters of each solution given the context of the design objective.

In reviewing the foregoing alternatives, we recommend that the original drainage solution involving the increase of landscaped areas and the installation of hydrodynamic separator be pursued. The basis for our recommendation is as follows:

1. Technical limitations associated with high clay content soil does not warrant the storage of water in landscaped or paved areas (via pervious pavement).

2. The objective of the design is to ensure that the quality of storm water leaving the property is improved over existing conditions. This objective is being achieved with the use of the hydrodynamic separator.

3. The contribution of 1.86 cfs to the 36 inch drainline in Papalaua Street represents a very small portion of the capacity of the drainline and will not affect onsite drainage systems in an adverse way; rather, the 1.86 cfs contribution represents a 0.07 cfs reduction from existing runoff conditions.

4. The cost of the underground chamber alternative does not appear warranted, given that the objectives of reducing drainage flows from the site and improving the quality of storm water leaving the site are being addressed with the recommended solution.

Please contact me if there are any questions regarding this letter.

Very truly yours,

KIM & SHIROMA ENGINEERS, INC.

By: Conrad T. Shiroma, P.E.
President

Enclosure
Hydrodynamic Separation Products Overview
High performance hydrodynamic separation

The Vortechns system is a high-performance hydrodynamic separator that effectively removes finer sediment, oil and grease, and floating and sinking debris. Its swirl concentrator and flow controls work together to minimize turbulence and provide stable storage of captured pollutants. The design also allows for easy inspection and unobstructed maintenance access. With comprehensive lab and field testing, the system delivers proven results and site-specific solutions.

Precast models can treat peak design flows up to 25 cfs; cast-in-place models handle even greater flows. A typical system is sized to provide an 80% load reduction based on laboratory-verified removal efficiencies for varying particle size distributions such as 50-micron sediment particles.

How does it work?

Water enters the swirl chamber at a tangent, inducing a gentle swirling flow pattern and enhancing gravitational separation. Sinking pollutants stay in the swirl chamber while floating pollutants are stopped at the baffle wall. Typically Vortechns systems are sized such that 80% or more of runoff through the system will be controlled exclusively by the low flow control. This orifice effectively reduces inflow velocity and turbulence by inducing a slight backwater appropriate to the site.

During larger storms, the water level rises above the low flow control and begins to flow through the high flow control. The layer of floating pollutants is elevated above the influent pipe, preventing re-entrainment. Swirling action increases in relation to the storm intensity, which helps prevent re-suspension. When the storm drain is flowing at peak capacity, the water surface in the system approaches the top of the high flow control. The Vortechns system will be sized large enough so that previously captured pollutants are retained in the system even during these infrequent events.

As a storm subsides, treated runoff decants out of the Vortechns system at a controlled rate, restoring the water level to a dry-weather level equal to the invert of the inlet and outlet pipes. The low water level facilitates easier inspection and cleaning, and significantly reduces maintenance costs by reducing pump-out volume.

Vortechns

- Proven performance speeds approval process
- Treats peak flows without bypassing
- Flow controls reduce inflow velocity and increase residence time
- Unobstructed access simplifies maintenance
- Shallow system profile makes installation easier and less expensive
- Very low headloss
- Flexible design fits multiple site constraints
Patented continuous deflection separation (CDS) technology

Using patented continuous deflective separation technology, the CDS system screens, separates and traps sediment, debris, and oil and grease from stormwater runoff. The indirect screening capability of the system allows for 100% removal of floatables and neutrally buoyant material without blinding. Flow and screening controls physically separate captured solids, and minimize the re-suspension and release of previously trapped pollutants. Available in precast or cast-in-place. Offline units can treat flows from 30 to 8500 L/s (1 to 300 cfs). Inline units can treat up to 170 L/s (7.5 cfs), and internally bypass larger flows in excess of 1420 L/s (50 cfs). The pollutant removal capability of the CDS system has been proven in the lab and field.

How does it work?

Stormwater enters the CDS unit's diversion chamber where the diversion weir guides the flow into the unit's separation chamber and pollutants are removed. All flows up to the system's treatment design capacity enter the separation chamber.

Swirl concentration and screen deflection forces floatables and solids to the center of the separation chamber where 100% of floatables and neutrally buoyant debris larger than the screen apertures are trapped.

Stormwater then moves through the separation screen, under the oil baffle and exits the system. The separation screen remains clog free due to continuous deflection.

During flow events exceeding the design capacity, the diversion weir bypasses excessive flows around the separation chamber, so captured pollutants will not wash out.

CDS

- Removes sediment, trash, and free oil and grease
- Patented screening technology captures and retains 100% of floatables, including neutrally buoyant and all other material larger than the screen aperture
- Operation independent of flow
- Performance verified through lab and field testing
- Unobstructed maintenance access
- Customizable/flexible design and multiple configurations available
- Separates and confines pollutants from outlet flow
- Inline, offline, grate inlet and drop inlet configurations available
- Multiple screen aperture sizes available
Hydrodynamic separation with internal bypass

The VortSentry is a hydrodynamic separator with a small footprint that makes it an effective treatment option for projects where space is at a premium and effective removal of floating and sinking pollutants is critical. The internal bypass ensures treatment chamber velocities remain low, which improves performance and eliminates the risk of resuspension.

In addition to standalone applications, the VortSentry is an ideal pretreatment device. The system is housed inside a concrete manhole structure for easy installation (often without the use of a crane) and unobstructed maintenance access.

How does it work?

Stormwater runoff enters the unit tangentially to promote a gentle swirling motion in the treatment chamber. As stormwater circles within the chamber, settleable solids fall into the sump and are retained. Buoyant debris and oil and grease rise to the surface and are separated from the water as it flows under the baffle wall. Treated water exits the treatment chamber through a flow control orifice located behind the baffle wall.

During low-flow conditions all runoff is diverted into the treatment chamber by the flow partition. At higher flow rates, a portion of the runoff spills over the flow partition and is diverted around the treatment chamber, filling the head equalization chamber. This collapses the head differential between the treatment chamber and the outlet, resulting in a relatively constant flow rate in the treatment chamber even with a substantial increase in total flow through the system. This further reduces the potential for resuspension or washout of captured pollutants.

VortSentry

- Treatment and internal bypass in one structure
- Compact design ideal for congested sites
- Unobstructed maintenance access
- Round, lightweight construction for easy installation
Engineered performance and installation simplicity

The VortSentry HS system employs a helical flow pattern that enhances trapping and containment of pollutants and provides effective removal of settleable solids and floating contaminants from urban runoff.

With the ability to accept a wide range of pipe sizes, the VortSentry HS can treat and convey flows from small to large sites. A unique internal bypass design means higher flows can be diverted without the use of external bypass structures. The design of the VortSentry HS minimizes adverse velocities or turbulence in the treatment chamber. This helps to prevent the washout of previously captured pollutants even during peak conditions.

The VortSentry HS is also available in a grate inlet configuration, which is ideal for retrofits.

How does it work?

Flows from low intensity storms, which are most frequent, are directed into the treatment chamber through the primary inlet. The tangentially oriented downward pipe induces a swirling motion in the treatment chamber that increases capture and containment abilities. Moderate storm flows are directed into the treatment chamber through the secondary inlet, which allows for capture of floating trash and debris. The secondary inlet also provides for treatment of higher flows without significantly increasing the velocity or turbulence in the treatment chamber. This allows for a more quiescent separation environment. Settleable solids and floating pollutants are captured and contained in the treatment chamber.

Flow exits the treatment chamber through the outlet flow control, which manages the amount of flow that is treated and helps maintain the helical flow patterns developed within the treatment chamber.

Flows exceeding the system’s rated treatment flow are diverted away from the treatment chamber by the flow partition. Internal diversion of high flows eliminates the need for external bypass structures. During bypass, the head equalizing baffle applies head on the outlet flow control to limit the flow through the treatment chamber. This helps prevent re-suspension of previously captured pollutants.

VortSentry HS

- Helical flow pattern enhances trapping and containment of pollutants
- High treatment and bypass capacities
- Compact footprint ideal for congested sites
- Lightweight design easy to install
- Available in both inline and grate inlet configurations
- Quick manufacturing turnaround time
## Available Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDS Model</th>
<th>Typical Internal MH Diameter or Equivalent ID²</th>
<th>Typical Depth Below Pipe Invert</th>
<th>Water Quality Flow¹</th>
<th>Screen Diameter/Height</th>
<th>Typical Sump Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>125-μm</td>
<td>ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS2015-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS2020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS2025</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3020</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3030</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3035</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4030</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4040</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4045</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3020-D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3030-DV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3030-D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS3035-D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4030-D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4040-D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS4045-D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5042-DV</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5640-D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5050-DV</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5653-D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5668-D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS5678-D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS7070-DV</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS10060-DV</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS10080-DV</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS100100-DV</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS150134-DC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.7**</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.7**</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS200164-DC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.9**</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.9**</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS240160-DC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.8**</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.6**</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sump Capacities and Depth Below Pipe Invert can vary due to specific site design.

1. Structure diameter represents the typical inside dimension of the concrete structure. Offline systems will require additional concrete diversion components.
2. Depth Below Pipe and Sump Capacities can vary to accommodate specific site design.
3. Water Quality Flow is based on 80% removal of a Particle Size Distribution (PSD) having a mean particle size: d50 = 125-μm, which is a typical PSD gradation characterizing particulate matter (TSS/SCC) in urban rainfall runoff.

Water Quality Flow, Particle Size & Performance Notes:

- 80% removal (Re=80%) performance forecasts of the PSD having a d50 = 125-μm is derived from controlled tests equipped with 2400-μm screen.
- Performance forecasts for specific particle size gradations or d50s = 50, 75, 125, 150 & 200-μm are also available. Removal forecasts based on unit evaluations conducted in accordance with the Technology Assessment Protocol - Ecology (TAP/EC) protocols, Washington Department of Ecology (WADOE).
- Units can be sized to achieve specific Re performance for peak flow rates for specific Water Quality Flows, over the hydrograph of a Water Quality Storm Event or sized to meet a specific removal on an average basis using accepted probabilistic methods. When sizing based on a specific water quality flow rate, the required flow to be treated should be equal to or less than the listed water quality flow for the selected system.
- Contact our support staff for the most cost effective sizing for your area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vortechs Model</th>
<th>Swirl Chamber Diameter</th>
<th>Internal Length</th>
<th>Water Quality Flow</th>
<th>Peak Treatment Flow</th>
<th>Sediment Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>50 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.21/5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.36/10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.59/16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.78/22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.1/31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4/39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.8/51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3/65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.3/93.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Water Quality Flow Rates are based on 80% removal for the particle size distributions (PSD) listed above with d50 = 50, 110 & 200 μm. Particle size should be chosen based on anticipated sediment load.

2. Peak Treatment Flow is maximum flow treated for each unit listed. This flow represents an infrequent storm event such as a 10 or 25 yr storm.

Standard Vortechs System depth below invert is 3" for all precast models.

Cast-in-place system are available to treat higher flows. Check with your local representatives for specifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VortSentry Model</th>
<th>Swirl Chamber Diameter</th>
<th>Typical Depth Below Invert</th>
<th>Water Quality Flow</th>
<th>Max. Size Inlet/Outlet</th>
<th>Sediment Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>110 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS30*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS50*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS70*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes models may not be manufactured in your area. Check with your local representative for availability.

1. Water Quality Flow is based on 80% removal of a particle size distribution with an average particle size of 110 μm. This flow also represents the maximum flow prior to which bypass occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VortSentry HS Model</th>
<th>Swirl Chamber Diameter</th>
<th>Typical Depth Below Invert</th>
<th>Water Quality Flow</th>
<th>Max. Size Inlet/Outlet</th>
<th>Sediment Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>240 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS36*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS60*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS84*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Models may not be manufactured in your area. Check with your local representative for availability.

1. Water Quality Flow is based on 80% removal of a particle size distribution with an average particle size of 240 μm. This flow also represents the maximum flow prior to which bypass occurs.

Notes:
- Systems can be sized based on a water quality flow (e.g. 1 inch storm) or on a net annual basis depending on the local regulatory requirement.
- When sizing based on a water quality storm, the required flow to be treated should be equal or less than the listed water quality flow for the selected system.
- Systems sized based on a water quality storm are generally more conservatively sized.
- Additional particle size distributions are available for sizing purposes upon request.
- Depth below invert is measured to the inside bottom of the system. This depth can be adjusted to meet specific storage or maintenance requirements.
- Contact our support staff for the most cost effective sizing for your area.
Customer Support

Installation
CONTECH Stormwater Solutions' products are some of the easiest to install in the industry. We provide comprehensive installation drawings, details and instructions, as well as full technical support on every project.

Maintenance
Maintenance of CONTECH Stormwater Solutions products is cost effective, straightforward and efficient. We offer a complete range of engineering planning, design and drawing, and construction services that can be tailored to your specific site needs.

Support
- Drawings and specifications are available at contechstormwater.com.
- Site-specific design support is available from our professional engineering staff engineers.

©2008 CONTECH Construction Products
CONTECH Construction Products Inc is your single source for hassle-free specifying and purchasing of comprehensive site solutions. CONTECH's portfolio includes bridges, drainage, erosion control, retaining wall, sanitary sewer, soil stabilization and stormwater solutions.
Nothing in this catalog should be construed as an expressed warranty or an implied warranty of merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose. See the CONTECH standard quotation or acknowledgement for applicable warranties and other terms and conditions of sale.

The product(s) described may be protected by one or more Patents.
Vortechs, VortSentry, VortSentry HS, and CDS are trademarks, registered trademarks, or licensed trademarks of CONTECH Construction Products Inc.
APPENDIX B.

Preliminary Landscaping and Irrigation Plans
APPENDIX C.

Interview Summary for Cultural Impact Assessment
A Cultural Interview was held with Mr. Howard Kihune and Mr. Harold Mizomi on Thursday, January 8, 2009, at Mr. Kihune’s office in Ka’anapali. Both Mr. Kihune and Mr. Mizomi are lifelong residents of Lahaina.

Mr. Kihune, a man of native Hawaiian and Japanese ancestry, was born in Lahaina Town in 1940. Although the interview was originally scheduled with Mr. Kihune himself, he requested the presence of an old friend, Mr. Mizomi. As Mr. Mizomi is five (5) years elder, Mr. Kihune reasoned “the older guy” would be able to provide a greater depth of knowledge of the lifestyle of years past. Both men with silvering hair, sun-tanned skin, and eyes bright with the experience of age, eagerly sat around a long wooden table to share their stories.

Once the thriving whaling capital of the Pacific, Lahaina Town was revived as a bustling plantation town by Pioneer Mill Company and its extensive sugarcane operation. Both men were born in the old Pioneer Mill Hospital, a building which once sat at the corner of Papalaua and Front Streets. At the time—Mr. Mizomi was born in 1935; Mr. Kihune in 1940—these streets were humble dirt roads, and the lands surrounding the hospital were open and green with pastures and sugarcane. Front Street was the main roadway across town, and with a hint of pride, they remarked that Honoapi‘ilani Highway, the main artery now supplying the region, was not yet in existence.

In the days of their youth, the furthest anyone traveled out of Lahaina Town was south to Olowalu or north to Flemings Beach. Mr. Kihune explained how a family could stop their car for a picnic along the old highway, and half an hour would pass before another would drive by. The Maui County Fair was then “a big deal”, bringing promise of a special trip to the other side, Wailuku and Kahului, a new pair of shoes. Otherwise, visits to the dentist or doctor were the only reasons for a journey out of town. Mr. Kihune recounted trips to the dentist as a small boy, legs hanging over the large, crude leather back seat of Kidani Taxi. After his regular check-up, young Mr. Kihune always enjoyed picking something out.
at the National Dollar store on Wailuku Town’s Main Street before commencing on the long journey back along the old highway to Lahaina, the rocky remnants of which can still be seen hugging the hillside around the pali.

Because such momentous trips to the other side were so few and far between, the youngsters of Lahaina were prompted to create their own, novel forms of entertainment. Mr. Mizomi, who was raised in Mill Camp, the plantation village circling the old sugar mill, chided his friend, remarking how “those town kids” (Mr. Kihune resided on Chapel Street, one street behind Front Street) would always come up in a pack and throw rocks at “us camp folks”. His arms raised in innocence, Mr. Kihune defended himself: “Hey, I never threw any rocks... I was always behind the pack throwing the rocks.” Rock slinging aside, the two (2) recalled that the sugar irrigation ditches were good for setting various objects adrift down the currents; and along the banks, numerous mango trees were always open for climbing.

Meanwhile, within Lahaina Town itself, much activity was centered between Lahainaluna Road and Dickenson Street, along Front and Waine’e Streets. Storefronts of mom-n-pop shops like Nakagawa Store, Kikawa Store, Nakamoto Photo Studio, and Ah Sing, the dressmaker, lined these roads. Yamamoto Store was a popular stop, as it offered shave ice and touted a soda fountain. The store’s proprietor, known affectionately as “Yes Man” because he always answered “yes”, also prepared spam sandwiches, which were widely enjoyed. Len Sweet Shop was also favored by the local kids, and Queen Theater was located nearby. The butcher shop was well-frequented, as was Nishino Fish Market, and many patrons would come in just to talk story with neighbors and friends.

Above Lahaina Town, life in Mill Camp was somewhat simpler. Fishing was a common activity, and Mr. Mizomi recalled that his grandpa raised chickens and vegetables. Mr. Mizomi also named the local grocers, Nagasako and Kishi, who would deliver vegetables to the camp once a week. They stopped at every door to take orders from each mother, as the women managed the households while the men worked the fields and ran the mills. Recognizing an opportunity to meet young ladies his age, a young and resourceful Mr. Mizomi “volunteered” to work for Nagasako, delivering orders door-to-door to residents of remote Honolua and Kapalua, for a token 25 cents an hour.

As the years passed, the growing Mr. Kihune and Mr. Mizomi noticed small changes taking place in and around Lahaina Town. In the wake of the April Fool’s Day tsunami of 1946, the Lahaina breakwater was built. Having never encountered such a creation before, Mr.
Mizomi wondered as to the purpose of such a curiosity, until he realized it was to protect the town from future tsunamis. Meanwhile, though agriculture was still the major industry in this day, tourism began to take root. Located within walking distance from Lahaina Town, Mr. Kihune recalled that Ka`anapali was once comprised solely of wetlands and cattle pens. In time, the first three (3) hotels, the Sheraton Ka`anapali, the Royal Lahaina, and the Ka`anapali Beach Hotel, were established on these lands.

When asked what they thought of the changes which have occurred over the years, the two (2) men took a moment to survey their feelings. Initially, their responses revolved around two (2) issues: traffic congestion, which generally affects local residents; and a "mish mash" parking supply, which detracts local retailers. Upon further reflection, Mr. Mizomi remarked that some changes are "not too good". Mr. Kihune followed his friend's commentary, observing that many people use the term "progress" to describe the transition away from agriculture. He elaborated, explaining that the problem with a one-industry situation (i.e. dependence on sugarcane or pineapple) is that the life of the community is based on the industry's survival. Although Ka`anapali has been "revitalized", the community's survival is dependent on visitors. Nevertheless, Mr. Kihune recognized that because of its deep and rich history, Lahaina is still a great town; the "old town" that enhances the resort areas of Ka`anapali and Kapalua.

Today, while many of the quaint shops and plantation-era residences have been replaced, particular features of old Lahaina remain. Although his street was inexplicably renamed from Chapel to Luakini Street, Mr. Kihune maintains his childhood home; meanwhile, Mr. Mizomi resides in the home his family moved into in 1950 after the Korean War. Considering all that has happened in the town surrounding his home, Mr. Kihune reflected at how, growing up in Lahaina Town, we take history for granted until we look back during this conversation and see all that has taken place.

Upon mention of the present McDonald's restaurant, situated at the corner of Papalaua and Waine`e Streets, Mr. Mizomi quickly responded, "You know, that used to be church grounds, one Japanese church." He continued, "I remember," gesturing upwards with his hands, "had the stairs going up the front." Like the old Pioneer Mill Hospital, the church was situated at the intersection of two (2) dirt roads, in the midst of sugarcane fields and cow pastures. Mr. Mizomi quipped, chuckling to himself, that the design of the new restaurant should be similar to the old Japanese church which once stood in its place.

In sum, the men expressed support for the reconstruction of the restaurant, recognizing
that the design of the new restaurant would be in keeping with the old-world or plantation era architectural character of the town. In closing, Mr. Kihune and Mr. Mizomi expressed simply that Lahaina is a small town with a significant history, and in this respect, sensitivity to what it is and what it is about is most important.
APPENDIX D.

Traffic Impact Assessment Report
May 3, 2009

Mr. Mike Yamamoto
Area Construction Manager
McDonald's Restaurants of Hawaii, Inc.
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 2000
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Traffic Impact Assessment Report
    Reconstruction of McDonald's Restaurant
    Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Yamamoto:

Phillip Rowell and Associates have completed the following Traffic Impact Assessment Report supporting the proposed reconstruction of the McDonald's restaurant in Lahaina, Maui. The report is presented in the following format:

A. Project Location and Description
B. Purpose and Objective of Study
C. Methodology
D. Description of Existing Streets and Intersection Controls
E. Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
F. Level-of-Service Concept
G. Existing Levels-of-Service
H. Mitigation
I. Summary and Conclusions

A. Project Location and Description

The approximate location is shown on Attachment A. The project is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Wainee Street at Papalaua Street in Lahaina.

The site is currently occupied by the existing McDonald's Restaurant that will be reconstructed. The restaurant will be enlarged from 4,274 square feet to 4,365 square feet (an increase of 91 square feet) and a second drive-thru will be constructed. The existing driveways will be used for the new restaurant. The site plan for the new restaurant is provided as Attachment B.

B. Purpose and Objective of Study

The purpose of this traffic assessment is to provide supporting documentation for the Environmental Assessment and Use SMA Permit Application for the proposed reconstruction. Because the project involves the reconstruction of an existing building, there is no change in use and no increase in the size of the building, there will be no change in the amount of traffic into and out of the project site.

Therefore, the objective of this report is to document existing traffic conditions along Wainee and Papalaua Streets adjacent to the project and to identify any traffic operational deficiencies.
C. Methodology

1. Define the Study Area

The study area is limited to Papalaua Street between Wainee Street and the project driveway along the south side of Papalaua Street, including the intersection of Wainee Street at Papalaua Street.

2. Analyze Existing Traffic Conditions.

Existing traffic volumes at the intersection of Wainee Street at Papalaua Street were determined from traffic counts performed during March, 2009. The intersection configuration and right-of-way control was verified at the time of the surveys. Existing levels-of-service were quantified using the methodology described in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)\(^1\). The purpose of this analysis was to identify potential operational deficiencies in the vicinity of the project.

D. Description of Existing Streets and Intersection Controls

A schematic diagram of the intersection of Wainee Street at Papalaua Street is presented as Attachment C. The intersection of Wainee Street at Papalaua Street a signalized, there are separate left turn lanes along each approach and the left turns are protected.

E. Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

The morning and afternoon peak hour traffic volumes are also shown in Attachment C.

1. The traffic counts were performed on a typical Tuesday, during March 2009.
2. The traffic volumes shown include mopeds, buses, trucks and other large vehicles. Bicycles were not counted.
3. The traffic volumes shown are the peak hourly volume of each movement.
4. Pedestrian activity was minimal during the traffic surveys.

F. Level-of-Service Concept

"Level-of-service" is a term which denotes any of an infinite number of combinations of traffic operating conditions that may occur on a given lane or roadway when it is subjected to various traffic volumes. Level-of-service (LOS) is a qualitative measure of the effect of a number of factors which include space, speed, travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, safety, driving comfort and convenience.

There are six levels-of-service, A through F, which relate to the driving conditions from best to worst, respectively. The characteristics of traffic operations for each level-of-service are summarized in Table 1. In general, LOS A represents free-flow conditions with no congestion. LOS F, on the other hand, represents severe congestion with stop-and-go conditions. **LOS D is typically considered acceptable for peak hour conditions in urban areas.**

---

Corresponding to each level-of-service shown in the table is a volume/capacity ratio. This is the ratio of either existing or projected traffic volumes to the capacity of the intersection. Capacity is defined as the maximum number of vehicles that can be accommodated by the roadway during a specified period of time. The capacity of a particular roadway is dependent upon its physical characteristics, such as the number of lanes, the operational characteristics of the roadway (one-way, two-way, turn prohibitions, bus stops, etc.), the type of traffic using the roadway (trucks, buses, etc.) and turning movements.

### Table 1 Level-of-Service Definitions for Signalized Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Volume-to-Capacity Ratio</th>
<th>Stopped Delay (Seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>Uncongested operations; all vehicles clear in a single cycle.</td>
<td>0.000-0.700</td>
<td>&lt;20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Light congestion; occasional backups on critical approaches</td>
<td>0.701-0.800</td>
<td>20.1-35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Congestion on critical approaches but intersection functional. Vehicles must wait through more than one cycle during short periods. No long standing lines formed.</td>
<td>0.801-0.900</td>
<td>35.1-55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Severe congestion with some standing lines on critical approaches. Blockage of intersection may occur if signal does not provide protected turning movements.</td>
<td>0.901-1.000</td>
<td>55.1-80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Total breakdown with stop-and-go operation</td>
<td>&gt;1.001</td>
<td>&gt;80.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(2) This is the ratio of the calculated critical volume to Level-of-Service E Capacity.

Like signalized intersections, the operating conditions of intersections controlled by stop signs can be classified by a level-of-service from A to F. However, the method for determining level-of-service for unsignalized intersections is based on the use of gaps in traffic on the major street by vehicles crossing or turning through that stream. Specifically, the capacity of the controlled legs of an intersection is based on two factors: 1) the distribution of gaps in the major street traffic stream, and 2) driver judgement in selecting gaps through which to execute a desired maneuver. The criteria for level-of-service at an unsignalized intersection is therefore based on delay of each turning movement. Table 2 summarizes the definitions for level-of-service and the corresponding delay.

### Table 2 Level-of-Service Definitions for Unsignalized Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Expected Delay to Minor Street Traffic</th>
<th>Delay (Seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Little or no delay</td>
<td>&lt;10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Short traffic delays</td>
<td>10.1 to 15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Average traffic delays</td>
<td>15.1 to 25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Long traffic delays</td>
<td>25.1 to 35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Very long traffic delays</td>
<td>35.1 to 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>See note (2) below</td>
<td>&gt;50.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(2) When demand volume exceeds the capacity of the lane, extreme delays will be encountered with queuing which may cause severe congestion affecting other traffic movements in the intersection. This condition usually warrants improvement of the intersection.
G. Existing Levels-of-Service

The existing levels-of-service were assessed using the methodology described in the *Highway Capacity Manual*. The results of the level-of-service analysis of existing conditions are summarized in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection, Approach and Movement</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (1)</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V/C Delay LOS</td>
<td>V/C Delay LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wayne Street at Papaloa Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound Left</td>
<td>0.10 28.3 C</td>
<td>0.46 40.8 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound Thru &amp; Right</td>
<td>0.14 17.5 B</td>
<td>0.40 20.8 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound Left</td>
<td>0.24 28.4 C</td>
<td>0.62 46.1 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound Thru &amp; Right</td>
<td>0.16 16.2 B</td>
<td>0.40 19.9 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound Left</td>
<td>0.15 29.4 C</td>
<td>0.46 40.8 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound Thru &amp; Right</td>
<td>0.10 15.6 B</td>
<td>0.40 19.2 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound Left</td>
<td>0.25 32.3 C</td>
<td>0.57 43.1 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound Thru &amp; Right</td>
<td>0.11 15.7 B</td>
<td>0.34 17.5 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Papaloa Street at Project Driveway**

| Westbound Left & Thru              | 5.0 A            | 2.0 A            |
| Northbound Left & Right            | 9.4 A            | 10.5 B           |

**NOTES:**
1.Peak hour conditions analyzed are "worst-case" conditions, which is the sum of the peak hour of each movement.
2. V/C denotes ratio of volume to capacity. V/C ratio is not calculated for unsignalized intersections.
3. Delay is in seconds per vehicle.
4. LOS denotes Level-of-Service calculated using the operations method described in *Highway Capacity Manual*. LOS is based on delay.
5. See Attachment D for level-of-service calculations.

The conclusion of the level-of-service analysis is that the existing level-of-service is acceptable. All movements will operate at Level-of-Service C, or better, during the morning peak hour and Level-of-Service D, or better, during the afternoon peak hour. These conclusions are consistent with conditions observed during the counts.

H. Mitigation

Level-of-Service D is generally considered to be the minimum acceptable peak hour level-of-service for urban intersections. Accordingly, based on the findings of the level-of-service analysis, no mitigation is required.

I. Summary and Conclusions

The conclusions of the traffic impact assessment are:

1. The project is located in the southwest corner of the intersection of Wayne Street at Papaloa Street in Lahaina.
2. The project is the reconstruction of the existing McDonald's Restaurant. There is no change in use and no significant increase in the size of the building. Therefore, there will be no change in the amount of traffic into and out of the project.
3. A level-of-service analysis of the intersection of Wayne Street at Papaloa Street and at the

---
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McDonald's driveway along Papalaua Street concluded that all movements operate at acceptable levels-of-service, which means that all controlled movements and the overall intersections will operate at Level-of-Service D, or better, during peak periods.

4. As Level-of-Service D is the accepted minimum level-of-service for peak hour conditions in urban areas, no mitigation is required

Respectfully submitted,
PHILLIP ROWELL AND ASSOCIATES

[Signature]

Phillip J. Rowell, P.E.  
Principal
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Level-of-Service Calculations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Configurations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume (vph)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour Factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protected Phases</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, G (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

| HCM Average Control Delay | 24.8 | HCM Level of Service | C |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.49 | Sum of lost time (s) | 12.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 60.0 | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 48.6% |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 | c Critical Lane Group |
### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly flow rate (vph)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrians

- Lane Width (ft)
- Walking Speed (ft/s)
- Percent Blockage
- Right turn flare (veh)
- Median type
- Median storage veh
- Upstream signal (ft)
- pX, platoon unblocked
- vC, conflicting volume
- vC1, stage 1 conf vol
- vC2, stage 2 conf vol
- vCu, unblocked vol
- tC, single (s)
- tC, 2 stage (s)
- tF (s)
- p0 queue free %
- cM capacity (veh/h)

### Direction, Lane #

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction, Lane #</th>
<th>EB 1</th>
<th>WB 1</th>
<th>NB 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Left</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Right</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cSH</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length (ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

- Average Delay: 1.6
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 37.9%
- ICU Level of Service: A
- Analysis Period (min): 15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Prot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

- HCM Average Control Delay: 19.1
- HCM Level of Service: B
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.20
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 60.0
- Sum of lost time (s): 12.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 23.7%
- ICU Level of Service: A
- Analysis Period (min): 15

Phillip Rowell & Associates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly flow rate (vph)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Speed (ft/s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Blockage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn flare (veh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median type</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median storage veh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstream signal (ft)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PX, platoon unblocked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC, conflicting volume</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC1, stage 1 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC2, stage 2 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCu, unblocked vol</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tC, single (s)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tC, 2 stage (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tF (s)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p0 queue free %</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cM capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction, Lane #</td>
<td>EB 1</td>
<td>WB 1</td>
<td>NB 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Left</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Right</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cSH</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length (ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Delay</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Capacity Utilization</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU Level of Service</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Period (min)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E.

Site Utilities Plan
APPENDIX F.

Colored Renderings