MEETING OF THE
KAUA'I COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMISSION
THURSDAY, MAY 26, 2016
3:00 p.m. (or soon thereafter)
Līhu'e Civic Center, Moikeha Building
Meeting Room 2A/2B
4444 Rice Street, Līhu'e, Kaua'i

AGENDA

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

C. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 28, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

D. PUBLIC COMMENT - Individuals may orally testify on items on this agenda during the Public Comment Period. Please call the Planning Department prior to the meeting or notify Commission Staff at the meeting site. Testimony shall also be accepted when the agenda item is taken up by the Commission. However if an individual has already testified during this period, additional testimony at the agenda item testimony may be allowed at the discretion of the Chair. Testifiers shall limit their testimony to three (3) minutes, but may be extended longer at the discretion of the Chair. Written testimony is also accepted. An original and twelve (12) copies of written testimony can be hand delivered to the Planning Department or submitted to Commission Staff at the meeting site.

E. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND GENERAL BUSINESS MATTERS

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Nomination of the Sloggett Residence to the State of Hawaii Register of Historic Places, TMK: 5-4-04:15, Hanalei, Kauai = Dolphin House – Thorrington Smith Partnership.

2. Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes Pre-consultation and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Pre-Consultation for the Lihue Town Core Mobility and Revitalization Project TGR-0700(073).

3. Report from investigative committee (Permitted Interaction Group) to discuss and explore draft update of the Kauai Historic Resource Inventory. Once formed and the task completed, the investigative committee will present its findings to the Commission in a duly noticed meeting for decision-making.

4. Discussion on the status of the Certified Local Government.

   a. Status of the National and State Register Nomination of the Hanapēpē Bridge.

   b. CLG Status

H. NEW BUSINESS

1. Hanapepe Bridge
   TMK: 1-9-04 & 10
   Hanapepe, Waimea, Island of Kauai
   Federal-Aid Project Number BR-0545(001)

   Notice of Consultation, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, As amended (2006) for proposed bridge repair project which involves the repair of the spalls, delamination and pier damages. Shotcrete of the bridge abutments, concrete finish of parapet walls, and painting parapet walls after all the repairs.

2. Puuopae Bridge Replacement
   TMK: 4-4-02, Kawaihau, Kauai

   Request for review of the Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) and Anticipated Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) prepared pursuant to the EIS law (Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343) and EIS rules (Administrative Rules, Title 11, Chapter 200).

I. COMMISSION EDUCATION (None)

J. DATE AND AGENDA TOPICS (June 23, 2016)

K. ADJOURNMENT

EXECUTIVE SESSION: The Commission may go into an executive session on an agenda item for one of the permitted purposes listed in Section 92-5(a) Hawaii Revised Statutes ("H.R.S."), without noticing the executive session on the agenda where the executive session was not anticipated in advance. HRS Section 92-7(a). The executive session may only be held, however, upon an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members present, which must also be the majority of the members to which the board is entitled. HRS Section 92-4. The reason for holding the executive session shall be publicly announced.

Note: Special accommodations and sign language interpreters are available upon request five (5) days prior to the meeting date, to the County Planning Department, 4444 Rice Street, Suite 473, Lihue, Hawaii 96766. Telephone: 241-4050.

KAUA'I COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMISSION
Līhu'e Civic Center, Mo'ikeha Building, Meeting Room 2A/2B

MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Kaua'i County Historic Preservation Commission (KHPRC) was held on April 28, 2016 in the Līhu'e Civic Center, Mo'ikeha Building, Meeting Room 2A/2B.

The following Commissioners were present: Chairperson Anne Schneider, Victoria Wichman, Charlotte Hoomanawanui, Deatri Nakea, Stephen Long *(entered at 3:07 p.m.)*, Pat Griffin, Althea Arinaga *(entered at 3:05 p.m.)*, and Larry Chaffin Jr.

The following Commissioner was absent: David Helder

The following staff members were present: Planning Department – Kaaina Hull, Shanlee Jimenez, Myles Hironaka; Deputy County Attorney Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa; Office of Boards and Commissions – Administrator Jay Furfaro *(entered at 3:03 p.m. and left at 4:20 p.m.)*, Commission Support Clerk Darcie Agaran.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m.

Ms. Schneider: Can we have a roll call?

Deputy Planning Director Kaaina Hull: Apologies, Madam Chair. Roll call. Commissioner Arinaga? Commissioner Chaffin?

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: Here.

Mr. Hull: Commissioner Griffin?

Ms. Griffin: Here.

Mr. Hull: Commissioner Helder? Commissioner Hoomanawanui?

Ms. Hoomanawanui: Here.

Mr. Hull: Commissioner Long? Commissioner Nakea?

Ms. Nakea: Here.

Mr. Hull: Commissioner Schneider?

Ms. Schneider: Here.

Mr. Hull: Commissioner Wichman?

Ms. Wichman: Here.

Mr. Hull: You have a quorum, Madam Chair.

Ms. Schneider: Okay.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Schneider: Approval of the Agenda. Do I have a motion?

Ms. Griffin: I so move.

Ms. Wichman: Second.

Ms. Schneider: Approval of the March 24th meeting minutes. Does anybody have any…?

Mr. Hull: Just to…I was under the impression that you wanted to amend the agenda.

Ms. Schneider: Oh, yes. Can we amend the agenda so that the CLG can come first? Anybody have a problem? Can we have a motion? (Laughter in background)

Ms. Wichman: We have to move for that?

Mr. Hull: Technically, yes.

Ms. Wichman: I move to amend the agenda.

Ms. Schneider: Do we have a second?

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: Second.

Ms. Schneider: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) So moved. Motion carries 6:0.

APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 24, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Schneider: Approval of the March 24th meeting minutes.

Ms. Griffin: I move to approve the March 24th meeting minutes as stand.

Ms. Schneider: Second?

Ms. Nakea: I second.

Ms. Schneider: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) So moved. Motion carries 6:0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND GENERAL BUSINESS MATTERS

Ms. Schneider: Announcements and General Business. Do we have any?

Mr. Hull: We have none at this time.

Ms. Schneider: Just that one (1) communication from the State we had.

Ms. Arinaga entered the meeting at 3:05 p.m.

Mr. Hull: Oh.

Ms. Schneider: From Mary Jane.

Mr. Hull: There was an addendum to the agenda, which... For the Unfinished Business for County of Kaua'i, Department of Water, there was an additional communication received subsequent to the posted agenda from State Historic Preservation Division that has been attached as an addendum.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Schneider: We ready to go on to the Certified... Oh, public comment. Anybody from the public who would like to...?

Mr. Hull: So at this time, for the members of the public, if there's any agenda item that you wanted to testify on, now would be the time to do it. The Chair also has the discretion to allow testimony to happen during the specific agenda item. But if there's any member of the public that wanted to testify at the onset, this would be the time to do it.

Ms. Schneider: Come on.

Dorothea Hayashi: This is the time to do it?

Mr. Hull: Well...so, I was just raising the fact that you can testify now should you want to, say, leave the meeting earlier, or the Chair has exercised the discretion to allow members of the public to testify during the specific agenda item. So it's up to you when you want to testify.

Ms. Hayashi: May I ask a question? Is the...we're first on the agenda, right? It's still at...

Mr. Hull: The agenda was recently amended to move the County of Kaua'i Water Department application second to the Certified Local Government discussion from SHPD.

Ms. Hayashi: I'll wait, then. I'm sorry. I'm sorry to (inaudible).

Mr. Hull: Thanks Kako. (Laughter in background)

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Re: Discussion on the status of the Certified Local Government

Ms. Schneider: So we're...State guys. CLG Grant.

Kaiwi Yoon: Aloha, Madam Chair and members of the Commission. Kaiwi, State Historic Preservation Division.

Anna Broverman: And Anna Broverman, State Historic Preservation Division.

Mr. Yoon: Thank you, Madam Chair, for moving SHPD up in the agenda. We'll be quick, so that you can hear other testimony. I know you have a long agenda today. Updates on the SASH. Any questions? Sorry. Okay. Updates on the SASH. Anna and the team have finished, statewide, the areas for the field research for the Statewide Architectural Survey of Hawai'i, a.k.a. SASH. Our next steps, Madam Chair, would be to give our consultant the notice to proceed to do context studies. Just as a reminder, there's the field data and then there's the context studies; both of which we're considering part of the SASH. If there are no questions on SASH, then I can move on to CLG training and projects business.

Ms. Schneider: Any questions from the Commissioners?

Mr. Yoon: Okay, so Madam Chair, I think, you know, we've historically had some issues with timing, as far as each of the CLG's presenting projects to SHPD for consideration. I did brief you, Madam Chair, last meeting that one of the issues we identified wasn't necessarily the project and when it's proposed, but it's also each of the Counties having different financial processes that sometimes prevent the match to happen for CLG projects; this County being one of them. Maui's different, the Mayor has this discretionary fund to fund projects, so that's a very different animal. So we are even getting closer to understanding what that means, but in the meantime, Madam Chair, as you guys contemplate projects and we get down...by the County level, how we can effectively do the match funding, we...you know, I did talk to the Administrator and because we have CLG funding that are, in effect, sitting there, you know, we are open to hearing the CLG's, as far as training. I did talk to Commissioner Griffin just now and there seems to be...it's not only this Commission, but other Commissions that want training. And the training could be Robert's Rules training, Sunshine Law training, to Tax Credit training, to whatever training it is, but the point being, Madam Chair, is that the CLG's have to communicate and be specific to what those

trainings are. Then, from our end, we can work on it, and Anna's already working with NPS to see, if indeed, the Counties do need to match if you guys want to do training.

Mr. Long entered the meeting at 3:07 p.m.

Mr. Yoon: For example, one of the trainings that's coming up that Anna and I are trying to attend is the Main Street training. If, let's say, this Commission wanted to engage in that, the Chair or our illustrious Deputy Director wanted to go to training, then that's something that we should contemplate early on. So whenever you guys identify the training, let us know immediately so that we can plan, you know, what that might look like. Any questions about that?

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: What are our options of training?

Mr. Yoon: So Madam Chair, what type of training? Or…?

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: Right.

Mr. Yoon: Oh. We're open to any kind of training that relates to CLG and functions of this Commission. So like I said, Tax Credits, Main Streets, Historic Register Training, Sunshine Law…

Ms. Schneider: The Historic Hawai'i training that we went through that Anna was part of, I guess, last year or the year before would be terrific for the Commission to do that again. Pat.

Ms. Griffin: Is there a deadline for this? Or…what is the process on approaching you and timeframe between making that happen?

Mr. Yoon: So Madam Chair, I would have Kaaina send us an email and, you know, I would itemize the training and say here are the five (5) trainings that we want to attend this year. Here's the reason why, here's the relationship to our CLG and how we need to gain momentum in this, and then we'd take that back to NPS and see, if indeed, there would be a match. So we have a meeting with NPS in May and we'll have much more clarity, if there is a match at all. We're hoping no, but…

Ms. Schneider: If you come back at the May 26th meeting, we could make (inaudible).

Mr. Yoon: I would get that in to me…

Ms. Schneider: Prior to the…

Mr. Yoon: Before that.

Ms. Schneider: Yeah.

Mr. Yoon: So I know that Commission members, you know, they change out because of their term, so I would advise, Madam Chair, that it's not only technical training, which is needed, but process and operational training, which includes ethics, Sunshine, those kinds of things. Just let us know and then we can…you know.

Ms. Schneider: But most of those have been done by the County already; the ethics and the…you know. But Historic Hawai'i would be terrific and… Pat.

Ms. Griffin: One of the things that hasn't been done for our group as a whole, and three (3) of our members are very new, is specific training on what we're doing here; how this Commission evaluates agenda items that come before us on historic properties, how to evaluate the changes that are being proposed for properties, and what the secretary standards are, just the basics on what a Historic Preservation Review Commission is doing. Like I said, since a third of us haven't gone through that, at least a third of us, that that could be really important to our efficient working.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you, Pat.

Mr. Long: I'd also like to mention that, in the past, we've attempted to have some additional education on the historic preservation tax credits, and maybe even the secondary bond market for those tax credits, and that's an incentive to the community and to individual homeowners for placing their structures on the State or National Register. So I think if all of us were really informed about that process, then we could talk to members of the community and get them excited about it, and maybe as a draw in for that. So I would suggest that that would be one of our primary trainings.

Mr. Hull: And I'll also point out that on the agenda today is the discussion for the formation of a Permitted Interactive (sic) Group, otherwise known as a PIG, for the specific purposes of evaluating and prioritizing training opportunities. So that will be later on in the agenda where you can divvy up and decide who is going to serve on that group, and then ultimately, perhaps they'll be coming back shortly with a prioritized list for training opportunities.

Mr. Yoon: Okay. If there are no questions, Madam Chair, that is the good news, which ends my part of this presentation. (Laughter in background) The bad news will be relayed by Anna Broverman, and all hard questions can be directed to her. (Laughter in background)

Ms. Broverman: Okay, so earlier this month I received the Commission's letter regarding the demolition of the Kaua'i Police Station. I thank you, Madam Chair, for reaching out to us to take a look at the project again. I looked at the project and the report again, and I talked with leadership with the County, as well as the Department of Accounting and General Services, and we've stuck with our original determination that it is an adverse effect to the building or a historic property affected. But we have decided to do a HABS report for the structure instead of accepting the existing report; that was the structural assessment. So DAGS has agreed to do the HABS report and will be starting it shortly.

Ms. Schneider: But we are still going to demolish the police station?

Ms. Broverman: Yes. Yes, we cannot prevent them from doing that unfortunately.

Mr. Yoon: Sorry. So Madam Chair, does everybody understand what a HABS is? Okay.

Mr. Long: I'm having a bit difficultly hearing as well.

Mr. Yoon: Okay.

Ms. Broverman: So the Department of Accounting and General Services is going to be doing the Historic American Buildings Survey for the Kaua'i Police Station before it is demolished, which includes writing a history of the building, as well as doing professional photographs. And they have the existing drawings for the building, so we'll be saving those.

Ms. Schneider: Any questions?

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: What was the survey that was already done on the police station?

Ms. Broverman: That was a structural assessment.

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: Okay.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you.

Ms. Broverman: Thank you guys.

Mr. Yoon: Thank you.

Mr. Hull: Thanks you guys.

Re: County of Kaua'i, Department of Water
TMK: 1-9-011, Hanapēpē Bridge
Hanapēpē, Waimea, Island of Kaua'i
Proposed improvement projects in the Hanapēpē-'Ele'ele Water Systems

Mr. Hull: So now, next on the agenda is Item G., Unfinished Business, 1., County of Kaua'i, Department of Water. Letter from William Makanui, Project Manager, Akinaka & Associates, Ltd.

William Makanui: Good afternoon, Madam Chairperson and members of the Commission. Appreciate you taking the time to listen to us again. I'm William Makanui and I'm with Akinaka & Associates, and with me is Tonia Moy from Fung Associates. We've been retained by the County of Kaua'i to design a couple of water systems for them, and we'd like to present them to you today.

Mr. Makanui and Ms. Moy presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Hanapēpē Road 6-Inch Main Replacement and the HE-01 – Pipeline Connecting Hanapēpē and 'Ele'ele for the record (on file with the Planning Department).

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: What is the width, then, of the roadway?

Mr. Makanui: The current width from wall to wall, the inside face, is 18 feet.

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: And adding that on the side reduces it by how much?

Mr. Makanui: Well, the side that we're putting…we show the walkway now that's 4 feet and you see those white delineators. Apparently, the County has put those there to reserve that side of the bridge for pedestrian use. So we'd be putting…it would be a 4-foot walkway basically occupying the same space as the current pedestrian reserved area, leaving 14 feet for vehicles.

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: Thank you.

Mr. Makanui continued with his PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Makanui: If there are any questions, we'd answer.

Ms. Schneider: Commissioners?

Ms. Wichman: I have a question.

Ms. Schneider: Sure.

Ms. Wichman: I have a question, please. So why doesn't DPW want it on the other side of the bridge?

Mr. Makanui: Right now, that side of the bridge has the elevated walkway, so there's a load on that side of the bridge. So I guess the concern was…oh, I'm sorry. So I guess one of the concerns was you have that load from the walkway and now you are going to add the load from a waterline carrying water.

Ms. Wichman: So the second one that you showed, does that narrow the bridge?

Mr. Makanui: It will take a couple feet from the travel lane, so you probably…travel lane might go from 14 to 12 feet or so.

Ms. Wichman: You said that the new waterline was going to replace the old one?

Mr. Makanui: Yes. There's currently a 6-inch waterline that's in that same location. It's partially visible…partially exposed in some sections.

Ms. Wichman: So it will be taken out?

Mr. Makanui: Yes. The system would temporarily be shutdown, they take out the existing 6-inch line, then come back and put the new 12(-inch line).

Ms. Wichman: Thank you.

Ms. Schneider: Pat.

Ms. Griffin: Thank you. What has the Hanapēpē Community talked about with you on their preferences?

Mr. Makanui: We haven't gotten to that; that was anticipated to be part of the EA process.

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: I think there's someone in the audience.

Ms. Schneider: (Inaudible) that would like to speak to this.

Mr. Makanui: Yeah, she mentioned some concerns regarding the bridge repair project, so we talked to County about…to see where they were on that.

Ms. Schneider: Any other questions?

Ms. Griffin: I have a couple more. Is that historic walkway…is that solid concrete?

Ms. Moy: It's actually falling apart. Sorry.

Mr. Makanui: I looked at the record drawings. It's a series of L-shaped brackets and they poured concrete sections between these brackets. It's got…its metal plated I think above and below, so it's rusted and some of the sections have…there's holes in them. I want to say one of my…oh, I don't think so. I had a picture of one of the… When I was preparing the slides, one of the pictures had a panel with a hole in it.

Ms. Griffin: Well, they are great slides showing, so closely, the historic photo with what's there now. But I'm wondering if there was any study about the possibility of stealthing the water pipe under the current historic pedestrian walkway section.

Mr. Makanui: I think we did talk to the County and bouncing back…Public Works, actually the engineer who's working on the bridge repair project, and he did not want…he had concerns about putting the waterline on that side of the bridge at all; whether it was inside the roadway deck or hanging it outside.

Ms. Schneider: Is there…there's a reason why they want it on the left-hand side.

Mr. Makanui: Yeah, I think he doesn't want…

Ms. Schneider: Connecting to the water system…

Mr. Makanui: I think it's more that he doesn't want all of the load on one side of the bridge.

Ms. Griffin: We totally understand different projects, different funding, and all of those complications, but at the same time, for the public, these very separate silos get in the way of an overall project. And this particular bridge project on restoring a very historic bridge, as Ms. Moy has described, has been long and, for many in that community, painful. So although, in your description examples, we can see where…from the banks and all the side and underneath would be visible from someplace, it's most of the people are going to see the pipe when they're walking or driving across the bridge, and so a metal covering will actually be very visible in a way that seems is going to substantively change the appearance and the experience of the bridge.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you. Stephen.

Mr. Long: First of all, I'd like to thank you for a really clear and comprehensive presentation, and also following up on our request for additional information from our last meeting. I think it would be really great if all of the people that came before the Commission presented their projects in such a really comprehensive and professional way, so thank you.

Mr. Makanui: Thank you.

Mr. Long: I did not see what I feel could be the most viable solution and placement of the waterline, which is concealed by the existing historical raised walkway that Pat was talking about. I'm also…I believe that there's also a bridge repair project going on, of historic nature, to repair this bridge, and I believe I just heard from you that the historic walkway has deteriorated to such an extent that it will need some serious attention. So why not coordinate these two (2) projects and place the proposed 12-inch waterline within, and concealed by, the to-be repaired historic pedestrian walkway?

And I have a comment about the engineer at DPW. An engineer is going to look at placing 12 inches of water in a line in a pipe on the side of the bridge that already has a walkway, and they're going to go oh, you know, different unloading conditions and maybe its misloaded on one side, but I don't believe that he actually did any calculations, you know, real calculations with engineers and coordinated with the bridge repair engineer. I mean, it's just sort like a yeah, it's not really a good idea, you know, overloading that side of the bridge; let's put it on the other side. It's sort of that kind of a comment.

So I'd like you to take a really serious look at both what Pat and I are proposing, and it wasn't in your presentation. And I perceive that as probably the most viable of the potential solutions; No. 5.

I do have some aesthetic comments to your preferred proposed solution. And that is the 12-inch waterline with the grate was taking up 2 feet of the pavement; yet, I don't know why the waterline couldn't be snugged up against the guardrail wall of the bridge. I mean, it doesn't move, it…you

know, you can have partial circular half-circle brackets, and you know, so I think it should be...instead of being made maximum, which engineers like to do, that it should be made minimum. You should take the waterline, it should be snugged up against the side, that a specialty bracket should be designed to snug it up against there, and then the grate or whatever grate cover or no cover should be made absolutely minimal, as opposed to 2-foot wide. So those are my comments.

Mr. Makanui: Okay, thank you. Yes, we can take a look at that. I can't speak to what was the...what the DPW Engineer based his remarks on. I know, right now, the repair of the walkway is not in the repair project scope. It may be in a future project, but what he told us was they are just going to repair the actual concrete structure right now.

Ms. Schneider: Is it possible to explore this concept?

Mr. Makanui: I actually have seen a preliminary drawing where they did show that being repaired, but...

Ms. Schneider: It seems the most logical.

Mr. Makanui: Yeah, it's not being (inaudible) at this time.

Ms. Schneider: Particularly if it has to be repaired anyhow.

Ms. Moy: I think that that project is like really old and I kind of remember it. I think one of the County's problems is that that walkway...

Deputy County Attorney Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa: Sorry, could you talk in the mic? Thanks.

Ms. Moy: So that walkway that's elevated does not meet ADA standards, so I think that's one of the reasons why the County is sort of ignoring it.

Ms. Schneider: Because if they repair it, they have to bring it (inaudible).

Ms. Moy: They have to also...they also have to do ramps or something to make it ADA accessible.

Ms. Griffin: But, Ms. Moy, there's no one in this room that's as expert about historic bridges as you are, and so you can probably comment on where there are and can be exceptions to ADA requirement in historic structures. And I know back in 2007 or '08 I went down with a former employee of SHPD to look at what was happening down there and it didn't seem like that was an absolutely essential requirement for restoring that bridge.

Ms. Moy: I agree. I agree. It's just that's what the County is looking at, I believe.

Mr. Long: Well, I know it's a different project, the bridge repair project, and you say that's been ongoing for a long time. (Laughter in background) So maybe if the Water Department wants their

12-inch waterline, they can light a fire under the people who are doing the long-term bridge repair project.

Mr. Hull: I'll just interject. (Laughter in background) Okay, Commissioner Long, we definitely…I think we can appreciate the desire for the two (2) to come in tandem with each other, but just given the fact that they are separate agencies and, even more particular, it's separate funding structures, so they are separate and apart from each other. We'd love for them to come together, I think, but just the nature of procurement and the way it goes. The applicants before you folks today can't make any official statements about the bridge roadway repair. And those folks from Public Works will ultimately be appearing before this body to discuss that, but unfortunately, these guys can't speak on their behalf.

Mr. Long: Could we talk to those folks before we make a decision on this waterline so that we can informatively evaluate whether the waterline can or cannot go under the historic raised walkway?

Mr. Hull: You can request comment from…

Mr. Long: (Inaudible) the funding such on two (2) different tracks that that's just making humbug.

Mr. Hull: My understanding from Public Works is that there are two (2) very separate tracks. But at the end of the day, this Commission can request additional input or comments from a separate agency.

Ms. Schneider: So we need a motion for that? So do you want to make a motion to…?

Mr. Hull: Before going to that, we recommend…yeah.

Ms. Schneider: Can we hear from the public at this point? Thank you guys. So, we invite the public to come and speak on this now.

Ms. Hayashi: Dorothea Hayashi from Hanapēpē, third generation; I got to put that in. I'm up here with the blessing of one of our kupunas. I was here at the last meeting and I'm here again to appeal. And I thank the Commission for their diligence on this project, and also the consultants. They came up with a brand new concept, which I still cannot agree with, but they had diligently tried to bring it…something forward that they thought that you would be able to accept. But I'm here to, again, appeal to you that at this time…I should just read from my notes. (Laughter) Then I'll do it better.

The community's desire to rehabilitate the 1911 Hanapēpē Bridge began when it was noticed that the 1927 walkway began to crumble, and this was such a dangerous situation that we did approach…and at that time, we had James Tokioka and Ron Kouchi still on our County Council, that's how far back this project goes, and the hindrance was the ADA. And that was something that we could not work around with at that time because it was a brand new concept at that time and I guess the County felt that it had to be ADA conformed; otherwise, you know, it was a no-

go. But we found through the years, and recently with the rehabilitation of the other bridge, the main highway bridge, we found that because they are going to be ADA conformed, they informed us that the ADA usage could be on that bridge because we're so close together. We're just...I don't know how many feet away. I can't...but if you look at it, you'll be able to see how close and it's rather simple to get into town through that bridge. But this bridge has also been...we had funding because of...I'm believing it's through the efforts of Mr. Tokioka and Mr. Kouchi that...however, it seems to be that every time it goes to bid, we're told oh, it's going to go to bid, and nothing happens. This is, I think, the fourth time that...and I may be mistaken, so its hearsay that I'm saying right now (laughter), but you can check on it. It was with our other...with Mr. Dill, Larry Dill keeping us informed that they...you know, it was going to go to bid, but it never happened, which really disappointed us because we really wanted to have the bridge, at least, shored up as you can see the rebar already showing. The time that we began the project we...it was pretty solid.

We also tried to bring attention to it by having the 1911...we had a birthday bridge party on the bridge (laughter), which we called attention and at that time, again, you know, the community came out and the community said we want the 1927 walkway because it has...that's the heart of our town. That bridge is the very center of our town, and of course we realize that there are many new people that have come into our town that do not have the history that we old-timers have.

I would like to kind of bring up a few...and I know this is not all of it. This is what I have in my memory. There's a...the Japanese used that bridge for a ritual. And this was handed down to me by my mom. The Filipino massacre or revolt, whichever, this bridge was the center of it all. I also saw a photo of a Hawaiian Airline crash, you know the 9-seater, I believe, it's a smaller plane, on the side of the bridge. It didn't damage the bridge. I've seen that picture. And we used to have sampans going up and down that river. They'd leave in the morning, they'd return in the evening. So the bridge was like, like I said, it was the heart of our town. My fight now is to preserve it as it is, and if... I'm wondering if it is was listed on the Historic Register on the National and State Register, what would have been the difference in the process that we're having today? You know, is my thought. With that thought, I wanted to ask you to look at this bridge as if it was on the Historic Register; that's my plea to you.

Ms. Schneider: I think that's our aim as well.

Ms. Hayashi: Thank you. And you know, the last meeting, I did ask if we could meet...the community, the Water Department, and Public Works...to find a solution to this together, and I'm hearing today that it's not possible, but I don't know why it's not possible. People should be able to come together because this is such a small island and the agencies should not be, how shall I say, in their own little pockets. We should all be working together. And with that, that's my desire. Of course that doesn't mean it's going to happen, but...and I know that this is the Commission...this is our last hope to get it onto the Register and we've been asking the County to, please, help us get it onto the Register. And we've been, again, told no. (Laughter) I'm sorry. I'm just going to say it as it is. I was told no, we cannot...we're not going to...well, I shouldn't say "not". "We can't help you" are the words that I realized that apparently there is something...some reason; that's my own interpretation and I'm going to just say it as I feel. But

because this is a County bridge, I feel that they should participate in trying to help us get in onto the Historic Register. Thank you very much.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you. Pat.

Ms. Griffin: Ms. Hayashi really spoke about two (2) things just then. One was the bridge itself, and I know that we treat eligible properties in the same way as those that are already on the Register. But the second, asking our help, I'm wondering if we can add that as an agenda item for next month to discuss, with the Hanapēpē Community, on where the status is on that nomination, and how we can contribute to moving it to a next stage.

Mr. Hull: Yeah, and as an update, I can say we did follow-up with SHPD concerning where that nomination is and ultimately, it was determined that...and this was several months ago, if not over a year ago...that the application did not meet the...not did not meet the criteria, but it was not...it was inadequate enough to go on. It's not to mean that it cannot be designated, it's just that it needed additional information provided.

Ms. Schneider: So we need a motion to defer this until we can sort of coordinate?

Mr. Hull: Well, there's a couple different discussions going on. You have a discussion about the road repair that has kind of, somewhat, needled its way into the agenda item. Specifically on the agenda item is the waterline itself. There is, I think, a desire on some parts of the Commission here and some members of the community that it be aligned with the roadway repair, and neither this body nor the department in which I work at can mandate that. So if you want to discuss that further, if you wanted further, I would say, input concerning the coordination of the two (2) projects, you can have a motion to submit for comments to Public Works concerning the coordination of the bridge repair with the waterline improvements; that's one (1) option. The other option is that specific comments, right now, could be established for the specific waterline improvements, or you could receive it for the record.

Ms. Schneider: What's the Commission's desire? Stephen.

Mr. Long: I have a comment, and that is personally and professionally I believe that there is room within the raised walkway to place the 12-inch waterline, concealed below it in some way. If it's not possible to coordinate the two (2) projects, then I would recommend that your preferred solution be of a temporary nature only, and that the waterline be relocated along with the road repair and the raised walkway restoration; that's what I think is the best...

Mr. Hull: And Commissioner, would you be...are you saying that you'd like to make a motion that the Commission adopt those...

Mr. Long: Well I'm just talking now because I don't want to force a motion. I'm just saying well, you know, I mean, it really doesn't cost that much to relocate, whatever, 100-foot of waterline. You know, maybe it could be coordinated and maybe our recommendation as a Commission is okay, so we can't control the timing, but when the timing comes around, we'd like it to be done

this way because we feel that's really, you know, an aesthetically optimal way to handle that. And I'm fairly confident that on a concrete bridge of that size that the engineer can find a way to place 12 inches of water on that side of the bridge; I believe they can.

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: Are we not talking about, in this discussion, the health and safety of the bridge and the occupants? And I think that should come first.

Ms. Schneider: Do we have a motion from anybody?

Bryan Wienand: If I may, I have a few things I'd like to say. I'm Bryan…

Mr. Hull: Hold on one second. Right now they are just in discussion, so the Chair would have to recognize that she's opening it up.

Ms. Schneider: Do we want to open it up?

Mr. Hull: It's at your discretion.

Ms. Schneider: Go ahead.

Mr. Wienand: Thank you, Commission. I'm Bryan Wienand. I'm with the Department of Water. I appreciate all of the various comments we've received so far. I just would like to speak on behalf of the Water Department that this project is intended for the community and we're here for the community. We want to make sure that we get everyone's feedback and we do our best to address the concerns, to present all the alternatives, and try to find a solution that works best for everybody. The purpose of the project is to improve water service. If we leave the 6-inch pipe on the bridge now, we can. We can simply leave it and it will continue to deteriorate and service will not improve. But we are certainly attempting to minimize the impact to the historic nature of the bridge and I appreciate the comments from the community. I think we are definitely working to minimize the impact, and we have been in close communication with DPW. The engineer we have been working with has been helpful; he chose not to come today. But we can coordinate with them as far as projects go. The concern for the Department of Water being a separate entity is that our project is funded with State funds that will lapse in 2018 and the current schedule for the DPW bridge repairs, as you know, has continued to lapse and continues to lapse, and the current schedule was for it to go out to bid at the end of 2017. In that case, if we were to coordinate the projects, realistically we would not get our project completed in time to use the State funds. So we definitely can attempt to coordinate and look into putting the waterline under the walkway, as its been suggested, but I would appreciate if we could walk away with clear action items as to what the Water Department can and should do. For example, if it's the Commission's desire that we look into and evaluate putting the pipeline under the walkway, we can look into doing that with DPW. And if the structural determination is that it's not safe, we would appreciate a clear determination as to which of the four (4) concepts presented today would be preferred, so that we can move forward with getting that done. If there's any other questions directed for the Department of Water, specifically, I'd be happy to address those. Thank you.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: You have to recognize him.

Mr. Hull: Yeah, you have to recognize...

Ms. Schneider: Yes. Go ahead.

Mr. Yoon: Thank you, Madam Chair. Kaiwi from State Historic Preservation Division. Being that we are in the process of reviewing this submittal, I thought I'd offer actually a question for Water. The current line is 6 inches, correct?

Mr. Wienand: Yes.

Mr. Yoon: And we are now doubling to 12 (inches)?

Mr. Wienand: Yes.

Mr. Yoon: Is the current capacity at 6 inches adequate for the needs of this community at present?

Mr. Wienand: In defining adequate, we typically use fire flow and various service parameters, so in our determination, the current service is not adequate in fire flow. Particularly to the 'Ele'ele area, it's not adequate for fire flow. So connecting the systems, both at the other portion of the project that we did not present on, but also in the Hanapēpē Town area, will improve the service and meet fire flow for the entire Hanapēpē-'Ele'ele area.

Mr. Yoon: Thank you, Madam Chair. So the reason...the justification from going from a 6-inch to a 12-inch pipe is specifically and only for fire flow, correct?

Mr. Wienand: Specifically it will meet fire flow and it will also improve service and reliability for our entire water system.

Mr. Yoon: I guess, Madam Chair, what I'm trying to tease out is if there's any end user functions that are enabled by doubling a line from 6 (inches) to 12 (inches). You know, as we contemplate the...and let me back up, Madam Chair...I mean, I was talking with Anna and I think this particular bridge is at least in the Top 5 of the oldest bridges in Hawai'i. And let me just be clear of where the State Historic Preservation will stand on this one, as far as architecturally. We are losing these treasures. And if we begin to get in the practice of losing the things that really make us uniquely Hawai'i, then we lack our identity. Architecture in this built environments are a huge testament and example of our history. This bridge, being built in 1911, I mean, this is literally a few years after...Kamehameha dies in 1819, right? So I mean, you're talking about a very historic bridge, and I'm not saying that SHPD is in the business of trying to, you know, be onerous on all of these historic structures, but this one is unique. This one is something that we need to try and preserve. That's why I'm asking these questions because if we're going to increase the pipe size from 6 (inches) to 12 (inches), then there must...that's a huge...that's a huge added value to that pipe, and I'm just worried that...not worried...I question...the reason why I'm asking these questions is so that the end user is not being contemplated of growing to such size that you need a 12-inch

pipe to service the communities. Is that understood, Madam Chair? Because if that's the case, then based on our surveys in Hanapēpē, specifically, and the great resources, residential and historic resources, in that area, what's next is my question.

Ms. Schneider: Pat.

Ms. Griffin: I actually am going to want to make a motion, but my first comment is to thank Mr. Yoon for saying that because, in fact, looking at our public roads and bridges, it seems to be a battle one by one by one, and the compromises so often are...in fact, destroy the integrity of the structure itself. You know, looking at this bridge, and it's why we keep talking, Mr. Makanui, on trying to break down those silos a little bit so that...because you look at your job, DPW looks at its job, we look at the bridge and the historic nature of it. Our guide is The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and this really does not fit into No. 2, the historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided. And I know Stephen wants to say something, but I can make a motion if he doesn't or someone else doesn't.

Mr. Long: I have a further comment. A further comment/question. Going from 6 inches to 12 inches is an astronomical increase. It's not twice, it's much more than that; both in terms of pressure and quantity. So here's an engineering question for you. I know you don't like to have a constriction in a line, but if you have a line that's this long, this...12 inches, and here it's 6 inches, it doesn't restrict everything down stream to the 6-inch capacity. I mean you still got water head buildup and flow and volume and pressure and all that coming down stream, and the bridge is right in the middle of this. So an engineering question would be, can you take a closer look at this and see if you can reduce this from 12 inches to...wow...6 inches? I mean that would be amazing, then it could fit in the existing hole or whatever; we haven't even seen that. Or maybe it's 8 inches, but is it really 12 inches? And you know, that starts making everything less, less, and less.

And then, my other second question/comment is with regards to...I really, like I said, I believe that the waterline can find its way underneath the walkway at some point, and it would be really nice if it was the smallest diameter as possible. So if I was going to make a motion, I would like to see what your...you know, and we are in support of the community getting their water and their fire capacity and we want that to happen as soon as possible. Yet, our responsibility is to look after the historic nature of the bridge, so I'd like to see whatever you do before the bridge gets repaired is temporary.

Ms. Schneider: Do we have a...

Mr. Long: And can you not even slip that in...can you not even slip that into under the existing walkway? I mean, we haven't seen any structural drawings, we haven't seen any sections, we haven't...we haven't even seen it as a proposal. So we don't know and you don't know whether that's a possibility on a temporary basis, or on a reduced quantity basis, or whatever.

Mr. Wienand: I apologize. Just to clarify, what do you mean by temporary when you say...?

Mr. Long: Okay, so you want to put...the community needs their water and you have your funding, you have your project, and you prefer to put it on the mauka side of the highway, and with our comments and I'm sure you'll make it look as nice as possible, but that's temporary. That's temporary until this long-term bridge project with the deteriorating historic walkway and this really important historical bridge gets repaired, and when it gets repaired, then you find a way to sneak that waterline underneath that walkway; relocate it, re-relocate it. On a big project like that, that's not that big a deal. And you could even design it such that it was relocatable.

Mr. Wienand: I would say that is possible. You're correct. We could do that. If, I would say, the long-term end use was intended to be under the walkway, we may as well do that now, during this project, so that it didn't need to be relocated in a future bridge repair project. And also, just to speak to your earlier point about the hydraulics of a 12-inch to a 6-inch, you're correct in that we could simply replace a 6-inch with a 6-inch over the bridge. It does present a minor hydraulic restriction in the pipe. It would still function. I mean as a system, the way we evaluate improvements like this project is we look at...for example, this project was identified in the Water Plan 20/20 Project and our Water Resources Division will evaluate with a hydraulic model what size pipes need to go where to meet standards and fire flow, so in this project, the entire length of Hanapēpē Road being increased to a 12-inch was determined with modeling and hydraulics. Because the length of the road versus the length of the bridge, if we were to keep the pipe or the bridge at 6-inch, we would still improve service and we would still...I would have to double-check all the specific numbers, but it would be...my guess is we would still meet fire flow. It would be something we would have to double-check. I don't think from the beginning we anticipated all of these questions about the bridge crossing. It was simply we're going to increase it from a 6 (-inch) to a 12 (-inch), but we can evaluate that; especially if it would make all the difference in getting the Commission's approval to move forward with the project to keep on schedule. So again, I just would appreciate if we would just try to convene a clear action items list to move forward.

Ms. Schneider: So do we have a motion? Stephen? Pat.

Ms. Griffin: I move that given the KHPRC's obligation/purpose for it being for historic preservation, we request of the County of Kaua'i and its consultants the answers to the questions that were made by the State Historic Preservation Division in its letter of April 1st and that we receive a 5th possibility of stealthing the water pipe...the waterline under the existing walkway by whatever means; whether a temporary, larger...temporary pipe be on the other side, or whatever the means necessary are taken to minimize the impact on this very historic bridge.

Ms. Schneider: Do we have a second?

Mr. Long: I'll second that.

Ms. Schneider: All in favor?

Mr. Hull: Oh, now you're in discussion.

Ms. Schneider: Oh, discussion?

Administrator Furfaro: Procedure. Yes. Two (2) things I do want…you should never have two (2) testifiers asking each other questions here, first of all. Secondly, you have a discussion now, and you can amend this amendment as you want, but you should go into discussion.

Ms. Schneider: Any discussion?

Mr. Hull: Yeah, I'll just point out for clarification for Jay. Yeah, I'm in complete agreement that, generally, two (2) speakers should not be questioning (inaudible). The only reason that I kind of did not interject and it was at the Chair's discretion is that technically on this permit, or I should say application, whereas this Commission is the Advisory Commission to…in Zoning Permits, the Planning Commission if it's Use Permit or to the Planning Department if it's a Class I Zoning Permit. Technically, in this application, the Planning Department has no jurisdiction over roadways. There's no zoning on the roadway meaning they will not be applying to any zoning body. The only approving authority, actually, when it's concerning the incorporation of historic preservation conditions of approval would essentially be SHPD. On public structures over 50 years old, they have actual approval authority on these projects. So that's why I kind of felt it was somewhat…generally it's inappropriate to have that type of back and forth, but because they are essentially the authority and the approving agency, to a certain degree, concerning historics, we decided to kind of let it go and at the discretion of the Chair.

Ms. Schneider: Jay.

Administrator Furfaro: To the Planning Department, it wasn't meant to point out (inaudible).

Mr. Hull: Oh no, yeah.

Administrator Furfaro: But going forward, you know, you don't want to modify a standard that doesn't fit with any of your rules; that was my point. Thank you.

Ms. Schneider: Any further discussion? Do we want to vote?

Mr. Hull: Yeah, the motion was made, so if there's no further discussion, a vote would be taken.

Ms. Schneider: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion passes.

Mr. Hull: Well, you can ask for any opposed.

Ms. Schneider: Any opposed? (None) Motion passes 8:0.

Mr. Wienand: Thank you.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you.

Re: Nomination of the Sloggett Residence to the State of Hawai'i Register of Historic Places, TMK: 5-4-04:15, Hanalei, Kaua'i = Dolphin House – Thorrington Smith Partnership.

Mr. Hull: The next agenda item is G.2., Nomination of the Sloggett Residence to the State of Hawai'i Register of Historic Places, TMK: 5-4-004:015, Hanalei, Kaua'i, Dolphin House – Thorrington Smith Partnership.

Ms. Moy: Can we just ask that the motion be repeated?

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Perhaps we can…

Mr. Hull: We can transmit you a copy of the…

Ms. Moy: Okay.

Mr. Hull: We can get the transcript from the minutes and we can…because it was a fairly lengthy motion (laughter), but yeah.

Concerning G.2., which is the Sloggett House nomination, the petitioner actually got back to us after we set the agenda and notified us that he would be out of state at this time, so he's unable to testify and further discuss this matter with you. So the Department would be recommending deferring it to the next agenda.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you. And now the next one is the PIG?

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: We'd still need a motion and a second.

Mr. Hull: To defer.

Ms. Schneider: Do we have a motion to defer?

Ms. Wichman: I move to defer.

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: Second.

Ms. Schneider: Do we have a second?

Mr. Hull: Yes, there was a second.

Ms. Schneider: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Any opposed? No. Motion carries 8:0.

Administrator Furfaro left the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

Re: Report from investigative committee (Permitted Interaction Group) to discuss and explore draft update of the Kaua'i Historic Resource Inventory. Once formed and the task completed, the investigative committee will present its findings to the Commission in a duly noticed meeting for decision-making.

Mr. Hull: The next agenda item is G.3., Report from investigative committee to discuss and explore draft update of the Kaua'i Historic Resource Inventory. Once formed and the task completed, the investigative committee will present its findings to the Commission in a duly noticed meeting for decision-making.

Ms. Schneider: Pat? Stephen?

Mr. Long: Yes, I'm a member of that committee, along with Anne, Victoria, and Pat. We've had five (5) 3-hour meetings and have gone through approximately 350 of the 500 structures that have been listed on this survey that are over 50 years old. We finished Nāwiliwili and Hanamā'ulu and Līhu'e, and we are about to move on to Kōloa and Kalāheo and Lāwa'i. We have decided to have an intermediary field trip before we take a look at the remaining 150 structures because there have been quite a few of the homes that had inadequate photography or research or whatnot done, so we are going to be doing a field trip and taking a look at approximately 25% of the homes and buildings we've already reviewed. Okay.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you, Stephen. Any questions?

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: I commend them for their hard work, timely hard work.

Ms. Schneider: It's amazing how many beautiful old houses there are. (Laughter)

Mr. Hull: And then if you can just ask for a motion to receive that report.

Ms. Schneider: I make a motion to receive that.

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: Second.

Ms. Schneider: All in favor?

Ms. Griffin: I move that we receive the report as stands.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you.

Mr. Hull: Then you have to ask for a vote.

Ms. Schneider: (Inaudible) vote. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) All opposed? (None) Motion carries 8:0.

Re: Discussion on the status of the Certified Local Government.

Certified Local Government FY2016 Grant Application to establish a repository of the curatorial care of archaeological objects and associated records from archaeological site from the County of Kaua'i adhering to the guidelines and procedures for the care and preventative conservation addressing professional ethics and specialized storage as recommended by the National Park Service's Museum Handbook.

Mr. Hull: Item G.4., Discussion on the status of the Certified Local Government concerning a Certified Local Government Fiscal Year 2016 Grant Application to establish a repository of the curatorial care of archaeological objects and associated records from archaeological sites from the County of Kaua'i adhering to the guidelines and procedures for the care and preventative conservation addressing professional ethics and specialized storage as recommended by the National Park Service's Museum Handbook.

Ms. Schneider: Nancy?

Nancy McMahon: Good afternoon. I'm Nancy McMahon from Parks and Recreation. I'm the Park Planner and I put this proposal together last time. Sorry I didn't really come up here and understand Commissioner Helder's concerns, and then after the meeting, we talked a bit. And it was actually kind of good because it gave Commissioner Wichman and Mary Jane an opportunity to review it and give me some additional things to change and clarify in the application, which I did and took those comments in and that's what's in the new application right now.

I think, just to remind everybody, Commissioner Helder was concerned that this amount of money that I asked for was very minor compared to some big scaling project, but he didn't understand this was a plan to do a plan.

Ms. Schneider: Right.

Ms. McMahon: To get the guidelines, to get the documents together, and to understand by reaching out to the archaeological consulting firms that hold the Kaua'i materials, the cultural materials from all the projects from Water Department to the Public Works' projects that we've had to...recently we had finds out in the septic system renovations in Hā'ena to what we did on the bike path; that way we can really plan better for the space and the facilities we need, and it will give us a start. Then, once we, then, find that, get that plan together, and get that space, then we can go get those materials back to the island of Kaua'i. So that was...and I don't think he understood that.

Ms. Schneider: No, I don't think so either.

Ms. McMahon: He and I were on the Board for the museum and he started talking about a project that, I think, a long time ago, maybe a couple years ago, I gave Mary Jane the list of finds that they had from Cleopatra's Barge. The museum has that. The Kaua'i Museum holds those and so does the Princeville Library. So those collections are already taken care, but that was not a County of Kaua'i project, and that's what I was starting out small and letting us be the first County to really

start to get our own curation facility. It was, when I worked at SHPD, the dream of the Branch Chief at the time, Ross Cordy, to have island repositories or curation facilities. The bill never moved through legislation very well. It didn't happen. They've told me there was a bill out there. I don't know. I think it's died in legislation again. It hasn't pushed very much.

Ms. Schneider: We haven't heard anything on it.

Ms. McMahon: Yeah. And it really brings to forth when I think a firm either goes out of business because they...someone's passed away or they've decided they're retiring from archaeology and they have a collection that they've been holding pretty much for free for the County of Kaua'i. And then what do they do with it because we still don't have any place to take it. So I think we can set the role model for being a curation facility, so I think it's a good project for the CLG to do. It's planning money, really, to do plans, which is part of what CLG's do. And it's also...it starts us out...I think we're going to have to look for more funds when we move on, but this gives us that basis to start that work. Mary Jane also suggested we have a committee together, and I'm for that; that's fine because one (1) person can't handle it all and I think that's a good flow with everybody. Clearly, we will come back to the Commission when we have the draft guidelines and to see if you concur with it and like what's going on so that we can amend it before we do a finalized product, which will be what the rules will be to show to SHPD and the National Park Service.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you, Nancy. Any questions?

Ms. Wichman: I have a comment, please. Thank you, Nancy. Mary Jane and I went and talked with Helen Wong Smith at the Kaua'i Historical Society about this project since she's written in on this. She has a lot of experience. She worked for an archaeologist in Hilo, Paul Rosendahl, who has passed away as well, and his collection was quite large. It ended up going to UH Hilo for students to curate, but they still had problems with storage as well. So the problem here is the facility, but in order to get the facility, we need to know how much we have, how much we're dealing with. And Nancy's right. This is an ongoing problem for many, many years, and they've tried through the years to get this through legislation. I think every Society of Hawaiian Archaeology Conference that we have we have this discussion as well. But I think Helen is a right person to deal with this, with her background, and Nancy, Mary Jane, myself, and others are very experienced at this. I really would like to see this project go through. I think the money is being well-spent. As far as planning, I think the money is right on just for planning, but it would be nice to know what kind of resources are out there for the facility as well. I think as...if you have a solid plan, it's easier to get the monies for a facility, or, you know, grants and that kind of stuff.

Ms. McMahon: Correct. And I would try to go back to some of the Foundations again. We might ask, again, for another lapse from CLG money the following... You know, maybe after we get this going, we'll look in the process.

Ms. Wichman: Right.

Ms. Schneider: So do we have a motion?

Ms. Wichman: May I say something else, too?

Ms. Schneider: Yeah, sure.

Ms. Wichman: Also, it was brought to our attention that the County of Kaua'i has asked the Historical Society to be a repository for their archives, and they don't have space; they just don't have any space. And so if the County is asking the Historical Society to help, the County actually should be putting up some money or some kind of facility to help out with this as well. So that's just a comment I have. Thank you.

Ms. Schneider: Do we have a motion? Any questions?

Mr. Hull: If there aren't any further questions, the Department is essentially recommending to this Body that a motion be made to approve submittal of the CLG application, but to allow the Department additional authority to finalize any agency or partnerships prior to submitting.

Ms. Schneider: Commissioners?

Ms. Griffin: I move that we accept the nomination as it's written and allow the Planning Department to make any amendments necessary to make this grant application for...to establish an archaeological object plan.

Ms. Schneider: A second?

Ms. Arinaga: Second.

Ms. Schneider: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Discussion about it? (Laughter in background) I forgot. Any discussion? All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Anybody opposed? (None) Motion passes 8:0.

Ms. McMahon: Thank you.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you, Nancy.

NEW BUSINESS

Re: Chapter 343, Hawai'i Revised Statues Pre-consultation and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Pre-Consultation for the Līhu'e Town Core Mobility and Revitalization Project TGR-0700(073).

Mr. Hull: The next agenda item is New Business H.1., Chapter 343, Hawai'i Revised Statutes Pre-consultation and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Pre-consultation for the Līhu'e Town Core Mobility and Revitalization Project TGR-0700(073).

So the Commission is in receipt of, essentially, a map that lays out what is being done with the TIGER funds. For those of you not aware, a brief synopsis is the Federal Department of Transportation has funds available for the purposes of infrastructure or roadway improvements for town revitalization or economic revitalization. The County of Kaua'i was awarded one of these grants to the tune of approximately $13 million to put infrastructure and roadway improvements in Līhu'e for the specific purposes of economic revitalization. So essentially, this was submitted as a, kind of, pre-consultation. If there's any comments that the Commission wanted to make on it, or if you would like to request a further detailed update on the TIGER Grant.

Ms. Schneider: I think we need a further detailed...more than a map (laughter in background) circles and arrows, if that's possible.

Mr. Hull: Okay. Myles is making signals at me. (Laughter in background)

Staff Planner Myles Hironaka: It's all part of the 106.

Mr. Hull: Oh yeah, no, correct. It's part of the 106 Process, as well as the 343 process. So consultation is required. This meets that bare minimum of consulting with you. It's not that the County of Kaua'i Public Works and Planning are trying to override. It's kind of if you want further, they can come back and give a full presentation, or if you just were like, moving on.

Ms. Schneider: I'd like them to come back and make a full presentation if it all possible. Pat.

Ms. Griffin: Thank you. And thanks (inaudible) because one of the...as a pre-consultation, there won't be time before our next meeting to make comments. There's a 30-day limit on this letter. So I do think that it's important in our role to make any comments. And at the Līhu'e Business Association program a month ago, we were fortunate enough to have our Deputy Planning Director and our Transportation Planner, Lee Steinmetz, go through the plan. It was excellent, and it's an exciting plan following on the Town Core Plan, which addresses a lot of the historic neighborhoods and roadways in our Town Core. So one of the things, comments, that comes to my mind as they talk about Rice Street where, you know, it's just one historic building after another, and the same is true of the Civic Center and the rest of the area that there should be care to protect and preserve, perpetuate the existing historic buildings, roadways, and other structures. For instance, there are...out in front of the Civic Center...I mean, excuse me, the Convention Hall, there are some historic lights that...now, I applaud the County for the job it's done on Hardy Street and they're just fine. And I don't know that there's going to be any other change, but that would be an important thing for the County as it works through the TIGER Grant to protect and celebrate these lights and other walkways/pathways that...as they're working on this revitalization to restore, rehabilitate the existing surfaces where possible, you know, as they go along.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you. Anybody else? So, where are we with this?

Mr. Hull: Well, if the...somebody can make a motion to reflect the comments made by Commissioner Griffin as officially adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission Board; that's one (1) option. Commissioner Griffin also brings up the point of the 30-day window. There is

that 30-day window. At the same time, that wouldn't neglect or negate the ability for individuals to give a presentation, and quite frankly, because the Transportation Planner is in my department, he'll be here. (Laughter)

Ms. Griffin: There are different issues. I understand that one is responding to this and the other is...

Mr. Hull: Is just an update.

Ms. Schneider: We still would like to see a presentation.

Ms. Griffin: A workshop.

Mr. Hull: Yeah.

Ms. Schneider: Yeah. So do we have a motion?

Mr. Hull: The quickest, simplest way would just to be a motion to reflect Commissioner Griffin's comments as adopted by the Board.

Mr. Chaffin Jr.: I'll make that motion. (Laughter in background)

Ms. Schneider: And a second?

Ms. Wichman: Second.

Ms. Schneider: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Any discussion? Anybody opposed? (None)

Mr. Hull: The motion passes 8:0.

Re: Appointment of investigative committee members (Permitted Interaction Group) to discuss and explore educational opportunities for the Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission. Once formed and the task completed, the investigative committee will present its findings to the Commission in a duly noticed meeting for decision-making.

Mr. Hull: The last agenda item is H.2., Appointment of investigative committee (Permitted Interaction Group) to discuss and explore educational opportunities for the Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission. Once formed and the task completed, the investigative committee will present its findings to the Commission in a duly noticed meeting for decision-making.

So this is the...going back to the discussion of educational opportunities particularly through CLG funds or other funds that SHPD has available, or that the County of Kaua'i has available. Our funding is not high at this point, but there are some robust funds generally available with the CLG

program. So it was to appoint up to four (4) members of this body to a PIG, essentially, to discuss and prioritize those educational opportunities.

Ms. Schneider: Can we appoint?

Mr. Hull: Essentially, yeah, I guess nominations can be made.

Ms. Schneider: I nominate Commissioner Nakea.

Ms. Nakea: I accept.

Ms. Schneider: Any second?

Ms. Wichman: Second.

Ms. Schneider: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote)

Mr. Hull: You could do it as a whole as far as a nomination of all members to the Permitted Interactive (sic) Group. And you can go up to four (4), but four (4) isn't necessary.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Minimum two (2), up to four (4).

Ms. Arinaga: I would work with Commissioner Nakea.

Ms. Schneider: That's great. Second?

Mr. Hull: Yeah, at this point, so it would be Althea and…

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Just identifying how many…

Mr. Hull: Yeah.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: How many and who.

Ms. Schneider: Althea and Commissioner Nakea. That would be…

Mr. Hull: At this point, just Commissioner Nakea and…

Ms. Wichman: You can be on more than one (1) PIG, right?

Mr. Hull: Correct.

Ms. Wichman: Yeah, I'd like to join also.

Ms. Schneider: Okay. Victoria. That's great.

Mr. Hull: Any other willing and able souls? (Laughter in background)

Ms. Griffin: Can you clarify a little further what this PIG is doing? The educational opportunities is the training. Is that…?

Mr. Hull: Yeah, it's go through a…essentially to prioritize potential trainings for Commissioners. There's an array of different trainings, but more than likely the focus of it would be through CLG funding, and so it'd take specific coordination with SHPD. And as Kaiwi pointed out, they can submit a list or they have submitted a list as far as conferences that the Commission can attend.

Ms. Schneider: Or people that can come and…

Mr. Hull: And that list we haven't gotten at this point. So I know there was some much more desire for some Commissioners to have a list of those type of educational opportunities as well, so we'll be working with Kaiwi guys to get that list of potential people that can come and do trainings. And the PIG, essentially, can review both those abroad trainings and those in-house trainings that can take place.

Ms. Wichman: Like the conference from last year in San Diego.

Mr. Hull: Correct. Yes.

Ms. Schneider: Yeah, yeah. Thank you guys.

Ms. Griffin: If you feel like four (4) is advantageous, I would be willing to serve.

Ms. Schneider: Great. So Commission Education, then, or the next meeting is May 26th.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Oh. So now that we have identified the members, now we can memorialize it, the scope in addition to the members in a motion.

Ms. Schneider: Okay.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: And vote on that. Yeah.

Ms. Schneider: Do we have a motion?

Ms. Nakea: Does it have to be somebody who's not in the group or doesn't matter?

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: No, doesn't…I mean, it could be…

Ms. Griffin: Help yourself. (Laughter in background)

Ms. Nakea: Okay, so I move that we form a Permitted Interaction Group consisting of Commissioners Wichman, Arinaga, Griffin, and Nakea to research different training options as Commissioners on the Historic Preservation and Review Commission.

Mr. Hull: Nicely done.

Ms. Arinaga: Yeah. Second.

Ms. Schneider: Good. All in favor? Oh, discussion. Any discussion? I keep forgetting to say that. (Laughter in background) Discussion? All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Anybody opposed? (None) Motion passes 8:0.

COMMISSION EDUCATION (None)

Mr. Hull: There is no Commission Education.

DATE AND AGENDA TOPICS (May 26, 2016)

Mr. Hull: The date and agenda topics for May 26, 2016. Is there any additional topics that Commissioners would want on the agenda?

Ms. Griffin: We spoke about it briefly, but to follow up on that brief discussion, I would request that reviewing the status of the National and State Register nomination of the Hanapēpē Bridge, and how we may assist, which is part of our ordinance duties, in having this bridge placed on the Register should be an agenda item.

Ms. Schneider: Sure.

Ms. Griffin: Also, a good agenda item would be just what we more recently discussed, which is having a presentation about the TIGER Grant with a particular emphasis on the historic aspects of the project.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you, Pat.

Mr. Hull: Anything else?

Ms. Arinaga: How about Item No. 2? Is that going to be deferred?

Mr. Hull: Oh, that will automatically be deferred to the next agenda item as the motion was made.

Ms. Schneider: Are we ready to adjourn?

Mr. Hull: Oh, hold on one second. And to clarify, as Myles pointed out, did you intend or want to request that SHPD appear concerning the nomination of the bridge?

Ms. Griffin: Oh, thank you, no. You reported, Mr. Hull, that the nomination had been sent back from SHPD for more work and information, so if we could just get a report on where it is, what the needs are, and how or who that could be completed, and, you know, how we can support it.

Mr. Hull: Given that, the Department will actually coordinate with SHPD on that because...well, the actual response we got from SHPD is that it was...it had insufficient information, but it was never transmitted back to the applicants or to the County. That was while SHPD was going through some challenges. (Laughter in background) And so we can work with them to see exactly what needs to be done to fulfill that and/or if they are willing to come and present specifically on that.

Ms. Schneider: Okay. (Inaudible) to adjourn?

Mr. Hull: On a side note, I will say that I would be remiss without mentioning, somewhat of a personal point, your former legal counsel today, about 45 minutes, was just honored at the rotunda for lifesaving efforts he made on the Nā Pali Coast with two (2) other individuals. The State House Legislature, the County Council, and the Mayor of the County of Kaua'i have declared that day on this day, April 10th but declared it today, as the Local Superhero Day. (Laughter in background) And while we missed the proclamation, which happened about 45 minutes ago, there will be a celebration of sorts in a historic structure on Rice Street known to serve... (Laughter in background)

Ms. Schneider: Serving beer. (Laughter in background)

Mr. Hull: Beer. Which I would say, being that you all worked with him, of course are all invited if you would like to attend.

Ms. Schneider: Thank you. And with that, we are adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Darcie Agaran
Commission Support Clerk

Date:_____

NOTICE OF CONSULTATION

SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1966 AS AMENDED (2006)

Hanapēpē Bridge Repairs
District of Waimea, Island of Kauai, Ahupuaa of Hanapepe
FEDERAL-AID PROJECT NUMBER: BR-0545(001)
TAX MAP KEYS: 1-9-04 & 10

Notice is hereby given that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, Highways Division and County of Kauai, Department of Public Works proposes a bridge repair project. This proposed project is a federal funded County project. It will be considered a federal action and undertaking, as defined by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended (2006).

The project involves the repair of the spalls, delaminations and pier damages. Shotcrete of the bridge abutments, concrete finish of parapet walls, and painting parapet walls after all the repairs. Construction is anticipated to take place in January 2017.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA, Native Hawaiian organizations and Native Hawaiian descendants with ancestral, lineal or cultural ties to, cultural knowledge or concerns for, and cultural or religious attachment to the proposed project area are requested to contact Mr. Kuppusamy Venkatesan, P.E. via email at kvenkatesan@kauai.gov, or by U.S. Postal Service to Department of Public Works, Engineering Division, 4444 Rice Street , Suite 175, Līhu'e, Hawai'i 96766.

Please respond by May 31, 2016.

COUNTY OF KAUAI
16 MAY -6 A9:11
PLANNING DEPT.

H. 1.

MAY 26 2016

COUNTY OF KAUAI
16 MAY -9 A9:17
PLANNING DEPT.

Dear Participant:

Attached for your review is a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) and Anticipated Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) prepared pursuant to the EIS law (Hawai'i Revised Statutes, Chapter 343) and the EIS rules (Administrative Rules, Title 11, Chapter 200) is available for review. A digital copy of the EA is also available for download by selecting the May 23, 2016 edition of the Environmental Notice at: http://health.hawaii.gov/oeqc/

Project Name	Puuopae Bridge Replacement
Island:	Kaua'i
District:	Kawaihau
TMK:	(4th.): 4-4-02

Comments must be received or postmarked by: **June 23, 2016**

Please send original comments to the consultant:

Ron Terry
Geometrician Associates
PO Box 396
Hilo HI 96721
Or by email to rterry@hawaii.rr.com

Copies of the comments should be sent to:

Proposing/Approving Agency:

Attn: Kuppusamy Venkatesan
County of Kaua'i, Department of Public Works
4444 Rice Street, Suite 275
Līhu'e, Hawai'i 96766-1340
(Ph.) 808-241-4885

Thank you for your participation in the Environmental Assessment process.

H.2.
MAY 26 2016