On November 29, 2021, Governor David Y. Ige issued an Emergency Proclamation, which continued the suspension of Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS) Chapter 92, relating to Public Agency Meetings and Records (also known as the Sunshine Law) as it pertained to the COVID-19 Response. HRS Chapter 92 was suspended to the extent necessary to enable boards to conduct business in-person or through remote technology without any board members or members of the public physically present in the same location. In addition, on December 29, 2021 and on January 26, 2022, Governor Ige issued a proclamation suspending HRS 92-3.7 to suspend the requirement to have at least one meeting location that is open to the public.

The meetings of the Kauai Historic Preservation Review Commission will be conducted as follows until further notice:

- Meetings will be publicly noticed pursuant to HRS Chapter 92.
- In-person meetings will be closed to the public to be consistent with social distancing practices.
- Commissioners, Planning Department Staff, parties to agenda items, and resource individuals may appear via the ZOOM remote technology.
- The meeting will be held by ZOOM.
- **Written testimony** may be submitted on any agenda item and submitted to planningdepartment@kauai.gov or mailed to the Kauai County Planning Department 4444 Rice Street., Ste A473, Lihue, Hawaii 96766. Written testimony received by the Planning Department at least **24 hours prior** to the meeting will be distributed to all Commissioners prior to the meeting. Any testimony received after this time and up to the start of the meeting will be summarized by the Clerk of the Commission during the meeting and added to the record thereafter.
- **Oral testimony** will be taken during the public hearing portion of the meeting via Zoom remote technology platform. Anyone interested in providing oral testimony must register and attend the meeting via ZOOM or use the "Join by Phone" telephone number. Once you register for the meeting, you will receive the meeting link that is unique to each registrant that cannot be shared.
  - It shall be the responsibility of the testifier to join the meeting through the Zoom link provided via E-mail to provide their oral testimony. In addition, it shall be the responsibility of the testifier to ensure that the Zoom software is downloaded and operational prior to the meeting.
  - All testifier audio and video will be disabled until it is your turn to testify.
  - Per the Commission’s and Chairs practice, there is three-minute time limit per agenda item, per testifier.
  - If there are temporary technical glitches during your turn to testify, we may have to move on to the next person due to time constraints; we appreciate your understanding.
- If any major and insurmountable technical difficulties are encountered during the meetings, the Commission will continue all matters and reconvene at the next scheduled Commission Meeting.
- Minutes of meetings will be completed pursuant to HRS Chapter 92 and posted to the Commission’s website upon completion and approval.
KAUAI HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMISSION
TELECONFERENCE MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

Thursday, March 17, 2022
1:30 p.m. or shortly thereafter

ZOOM LINK:
https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_CRMethniczvZvZYOpCzcBQ

To Join by Phone:
US: +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 9128 or +1 253 215 8782 or
+1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 301 715 8592
Webinar ID: 994 1754 1250
Participant ID: #

A. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIR

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. January 27, 2022
2. February 17, 2022

E. COMMUNICATIONS

F. PUBLIC COMMENT. The Kaua‘i Historic Preservation Review Commission will accept written testimony for any agenda item. Written testimony indicating your 1) name, and if applicable, your position/title and organization you are representing, and 2) the agenda item that you are providing comment on, may be submitted in writing to planningdepartment@kauai.gov or mailed to the County of Kaua‘i Planning Department, 4444 Rice Street, Suite 473, Līhu‘e, Hawai‘i 96766. Written testimony received by the Planning Department before 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 16, 2022, will be distributed to all Commissioners prior to the meeting. Written testimony received after 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 16, 2022, will be summarized by the Clerk of the Commission during the meeting and added to the record thereafter.
Oral testimony will be taken at the beginning of the meeting on any agenda item via the Zoom remote technology platform and it shall be the responsibility of the testifier to ensure that the Zoom software is downloaded prior to the meeting.

G. CONSENT CALENDAR

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Hawai‘i Department of Transportation and Federal Highways Administration
   Programmatic Agreement for Minor Hawai‘i Historic Bridge Projects Statewide
   National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian
   Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties. [Director’s report received and
   deferred 3/18/2021; Supplemental #1 to the Director’s report received and deferred
   11/18/2021; Supplemental #2 to the Director’s report received and deferred
   1/27/2022]
   
a. Supplemental #3 to the Director’s report pertaining to this matter.

2. 3 Palms, LLC
   Douglas Baldwin Beach House Improvements
   Property Address: 5242 Weke Road
   Tax Map Key: (4) 5-5-002:107
   Hanalei, Hawai‘i
   Consideration of a Class I Zoning Permit for garage renovations and the addition of
   an outdoor shower. [Director’s report received 1/27/2022]
   
a. Supplemental #1 to the Director’s report pertaining to this matter.

I. GENERAL BUSINESS MATTERS

1. Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Overview

J. ANNOUNCEMENTS

K. SELECTION OF NEXT MEETING DATE AND AGENDA TOPICS (April 21, 2022)

L. ADJOURNMENT

EXECUTIVE SESSION: The Commission may go into executive session on an agenda item for one
of the permitted purposes listed in Section 92-5(a) Hawai‘i 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 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: IF YOU NEED AN AUXILIARY AID/SERVICE, OTHER ACCOMMODATION DUE TO A
DISABILITY, OR AN INTERPRETER FOR NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING PERSONS, PLEASE CONTACT
THE OFFICE OF BOARDS & COMMISSIONS AT (808) 241-4917 OR ASEGRET@KAUAI.GOV AS
SOON AS POSSIBLE. REQUESTS MADE AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE WILL ALLOW ADEQUATE TIME TO
FULFILL YOUR REQUEST.

UPON REQUEST, THIS NOTICE IS AVAILABLE IN ALTERNATE FORMATS SUCH AS LARGE PRINT,
BRAILLE, OR ELECTRONIC COPY.
COUNTY OF KAUA‘I  
Minutes of Meeting  
OPEN SESSION  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Commission:</th>
<th>Kaua‘i Historic Preservation Review Commission</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>January 27, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Zoom Teleconference</td>
<td>Start of Meeting:</td>
<td>1:34 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End of Meeting:</td>
<td>3:33 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excused</td>
<td>Chair Gerald Ida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Call To Order</td>
<td>Chair Pro Tem Remoaldo called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Roll Call</td>
<td>Deputy Director Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa verified attendance by roll call and requested a verbal response; Commissioner Guerber replied here. Commissioner Larson replied here. Commissioner Long replied here. Commissioner Summers replied here. Vice Chair Remoaldo replied here. Chair Ida was excused. Quorum was established with five commissioners present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C. Elections | Chair Pro Tem Remoaldo opened the floor for chair nominations.  
• Ms. Larson nominated Susan Remoaldo.  
• Ms. Summers nominated Carolyn Larson.  
• Chair Pro Tem Remoaldo nominated Stephen Long. | Mr. Guerber moved to close nominations for chair. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0. |

Chair Pro Tem Remoaldo announced each nomination and counted the votes:  
1. Carolyn Larson – Three votes (Ms. Summers, Mr. Long, Mr. Guerber)  
2. Stephen Long – One vote (Chair Pro Tem Remoaldo)  
3. Susan Remoaldo – One vote (Ms. Larson)
Carolyn Larson garnered the most votes and became chair for calendar year 2022.

Chair Pro Tem Remoaldo opened the floor for vice chair nominations.
- Ms. Larson nominated Susan Remoaldo.
- Mr. Guerber nominated Stephen Long.

Chair Pro Tem Remoaldo announced each nomination and counted the votes:
1. Stephen Long – Three votes (Chair Pro Tem Remoaldo, Ms. Summers, Mr. Guerber)
2. Susan Remoaldo – Two Votes (Mr. Long, Ms. Larson)

Stephen Long garnered the most votes and became vice chair for calendar year 2022. Ms. Larson assumed the chair position and Mr. Long assumed the vice chair position.

Ms. Summers moved to close nominations for vice chair. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Approval of the Agenda</td>
<td>Ms. Remoaldo moved to approve the January 27, 2022 agenda, as circulated. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Approval of the Minutes</td>
<td>1. August 19, 2021</td>
<td>Mr. Guerber moved to approve the August 19, 2021 minutes as circulated. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. October 21, 2021</td>
<td>Mr. Guerber moved to approve the amended October 21, 2021 minutes with the following corrections on page 2, “lauea” should be “lauae”, page 6, “Chair Iida” should be “Chair Ida”, page 11, “palette” should be “pallet” and page 12, “wouldn’t” should be “would”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. November 18, 2021</td>
<td>Ms. Remoaldo requested correction on page 4 “holly” to “holy”.</td>
<td>Ida”, page 11, “pallet” should be “palette” and page 12, “wouldn’t” should be “would”. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Communications</td>
<td>There were no communications.</td>
<td>Ms. Remoaldo moved to approve the amended November 18, 2021, minutes with a correction on page 4, “holly” to “holy”. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Public Comment</td>
<td>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa paused to allow anyone from the public to testify. Hearing none they moved to the next agenda item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Consent Calendar</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I. Unfinished Business | I.1. **Hawai‘i Department of Transportation and Federal Highways Administration Programmatic Agreement for Minor Hawai‘i Historic Bridge Projects Statewide** National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties. [Director’s report received and deferred 3/18/21; Supplemental #1 to the Director’s report received and deferred 11/18/21] a. Supplemental #2 to the Director’s Report pertaining to this matter. Ms. Valenciano shared the following;  
  - This project was reviewed several times by the commission.  
  - In November 2021 the commission was asked to review the draft PA and list comments on a spreadsheet.  
  - The commission’s action was to provide comments and directions on the draft Programmatic |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Agreement (PA) and supplemental documents;  
  - Receive the updated report documents and provide comments  
  - Defer and withhold comments until future drafts become available | | |
| Received comments from Chair Larson and Ms. Remoaldo and encouraged the rest of the commissioners to review the updated draft PA and provide their input. | | |
| Ikaika Kincaid and Barbara Shidler were present to answer questions and clarify the timelines and expectations;  
  - They have scheduled presentations of the draft PA in March.  
  - Would return for the March KHPRC meeting to review the comments and discuss any conflicts.  
  - Request a compiled comment list from the commission by the end of March 2022. | | |
| Questions:  
  1. Vice Chair Long remembered that signage was supposed to be included in the PA. Mr. Kincaid replied that a component of signage was in the PA.  
  2. Vice Chair Long stated there was no reference to signage in the index. Mr. Kincaid replied it was in Chapter 6, miscellaneous. Ms. Shidler said there was an Excel file matrix summary that listed all the sections to be included in the PA. Ms. Valenciano said the materials they referenced were included in the November packet, it was not included in this packet. | | |
| Vice Chair Long asked for a brief description of the signage component. Mr. Kincaid shared the following;  
  - Three tier levels for every activity that explain what to do and how to do a particular activity. Tier one included basic activities that did not require use of the best practice manual. Tier two activities would follow the best practices manual included in the PA. Tier three activities would follow the best practices manual and require a qualified professional to review plans and work to be completed.  
  - The signage would be considered a tier one activity and placed under 6.2 Signage and 6.2.1 free standing signage. | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|         | • Each activity included one or two sentences that explained the activity but did not include specific details.  
|         | • They need the commissions comments to assist in establishing specific detailed guidelines for each activity and so it was very important that the commissioners focus on establishing a list of comments.  
|         | • The commissioner’s comments would create the best practices manual for the PA.  
|         | Vice Chair Long requested that signage be removed from tier one and placed in tier two and Ms. Valenciano asked that the discussion be taken off line. Ms. Shidler said they would return to the commission at the end of 2022 with a final PA for the commission to review. She asked for comments on the tier system. The specific details would be placed into the full PA when its finished.  
|         | 3. Ms. Remoaldo stated her comments were not conflicting it would add to make the document user friendly. Mr. Kincaid said the conflict would be if one commissioner commented and another commissioner commented the opposite, that would be considered a conflict and would need to be worked out. He asked that they also review the language. A draft best practices manual would include sketches and the glossary may include sketches or pictures.  
| J. New Business | J.1. 3 Palms, LLC  
|         | Douglas Baldwin Beach House Improvements  
|         | Property Address: 5242 Weke Road  
|         | Tax Map Key: (4) 5-5-002:107  
|         | Mr. Guerber moved to defer the Hawai‘i Department of Transportation and Federal Highways Administration Programmatic Agreement for Minor Hawai‘i Historic Bridge Projects Statewide, until a future meeting, possibly in March 2022. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.  
|         |
## SUBJECT
Hanalei, Hawai‘i
Consideration of a Class I Zoning Permit for garage renovations and the addition of an outdoor showers.

## DISCUSSION
a. Director’s Report pertaining to this matter.

Ms. Valenciano shared the following;
- The commission’s action for the project was to;
  - Support the project
  - Recommend to the department to approve any zoning permits with conditions
  - Recommend to the department to consider denial of permits
  - Recommend to the department to defer action on the permits

- This property came before the commission in the past and most recently March 2021, but it was for a different permit.
- Read portions of the Director’s Report dated November 18, 2022.
- Property under the Hawai‘i State Register and the garage was a contributing feature to the historic property.
- The department recommends support the project as outlined in the director’s report.

Ian Jung shared 3Palms LLC project garage repair & replace preliminary permit set plans dated September 22, 2021 also on the call was Architect Mark Eyler;
- The garage renovation included replacement garage doors and windows, improvements to the outdoor shed, bike port, move an interior wall to increase storage space and outdoor rock wall shower that was not attached to the garage wall.
- Lattice garage doors would be replaced with panels that have an accordion opening.
- Windows replaced with new in-kind wood windows.
- New lava rock wall would surround an outdoor shower.
- Shed would have a new concrete pad and roof.

## ACTION

Questions
1. Ms. Remoaldo asked if the home and garage were built the same time. Mr. Jung said the records indicate the garage and home could have been built sometime between 1928 and 1936;
however, there were no records of the exact date.

2. Ms. Remoaldo asked if the garage was renovated and if the lattice garage door was original. Mr. Jung assumed it was not but did not have any photographic evidence. The previous owner may have added the lattice and it was probably done in the 1980’s.

3. Ms. Remoaldo stated the plans showed the lava rocks would be placed on cmu (concrete masonry units) blocks and asked if the rocks would be real or fake. Mr. Jung assumed it would be real lava rocks. Ms. Remoaldo recommended real lava rocks be used in keeping with the historic feel of the property.

Ms. Summers said page A05 of the plans showed cmu blocks with lava rocks attached.

4. Vice Chair Long asked to see a photo of the existing garage doors. Mr. Jung shared a colored photo of the existing lattice garage door.

The commission discussed the garage doors;

- Vice Chair Long said the proposed doors looked like Fleetwood commercial doors and did not look historic and asked that they research and look for historic garage doors.
- Ms. Summers commented that maybe a photo of the proposed garage door would be better because it did look historic.
- Mr. Guerber said the garage door looked historic when closed, but it didn’t once open.
- Chair Larson commented that comparisons would help.

Vice Chair Long commented that the computer graphic drawing of the rock wall looked harsh and requested they soften the outline of the lava rock wall to make it look more organic. Mr. Jung said he would work with the architect.

Chair Larson summarized that the commission requested attention to the form of the rock wall, so it looked organic and a solution to the garage door. Mr. Jung said they would survey the area and bring alternatives to the department or back to the commission.

Vice Chair Long motioned to accept the 3 Palms, LLC Douglas Baldwin Beach House Improvements, Property
Chair Larson commented that the property was a jewel, and it would be great to get it right. Mr. Jung appreciated the comment and would return with alternatives for the commission to review at a future meeting.

Chair Larson called for the vote.

Motion carried 5:0.

**K. General Business Matters**

1. **Westside Historic Inventory Permitted Interaction Group (PIG)**

Vice Chair Long requested this placed back on the agenda because his goal was to continue the work and didn’t want his term to end without completing the inventory list. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa apologized and replied that due to COVID this would be placed on hold until cases subside.

1. Chair Larson asked Vice Chair Long if this was to increase the inventory list. Vice Chair...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long stated that KHPRC took charge of the historic inventory list after a consultant who was paid $58,000 did nothing to it. He knew COVID was an issue and said they could continue to do the work and drive around in separate cars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chair Larson asked when the inventory was last updated. Vice Chair Long replied that there were six or five districts and Līhuʻe and Kalāheo were completed. Ms. Valenciano said Līhuʻe and portions of southside were recently updated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mr. Guerber inquired about the process, if they needed to follow a list and was google maps used. Planner Myles Hironaka gave some background history. He said efforts were made in 2012 to update two areas Līhuʻe and the south shore. A consultant was hired using CLG (Certified Local Government) funds; however, the CLG grant process took so long that it left the consultant with only two to three months to complete the inventory list. The consultant created a large list, and the state historic preservation division asked the department to pare it down. That was the job of the PIG (Permitted Interaction Group). The PIG used google maps, but it was not informative and clear enough for the PIG to make an assessment. The PIG requested to physically drive to each property and analyzed each one together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chair Larson asked what was wrong with using google maps. Mr. Hiranaka said it was harder to look online and decipher whether a building was altered, had major additions and in tact without losing integrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mr. Guerber asked if the consultants ever came to Kauaʻi. Mr. Hiranaka replied they did.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said while they wait for things to settle, she would seek CLG or other grant money to complete the inventory list. She also suggested that prior to continuing the inventory list they development guidelines and criteria using information from the department of Interior.

Ms. Larson asked the department to provide a thorough description of the inventory list, develop a process and come up with options on how to proceed.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said Mr. Hiranaka found that Portland, Oregon developed a manual specifically for historic architecture in their area. Mr. Hiranaka shared the legislation had a bill seeking to fund the state historic preservation division for archaeological and building inventories. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa added that SB 2757 was for $2.1 million.
### 2. Discussion on minimum requirements for Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or architectural documentation as a mitigation to demolition projects

Chair Larson asked if anyone was familiar with the contents in a HABS report and no one knew; however, Ms. Summers said it was quite extensive and expensive. Chair Larson asked for a report to see if any of the criteria could be pared down and used for their purpose. Ms. Valenciano said she would forward information to an official HABS website that contained explanations and possible samples that they could browse through.

Ms. Larson asked that staff provide a presentation on HABS and explain what the criteria were, and what would be considered optional or mandatory. She also volunteered to help and asked to be included with the historic inventory.

Mr. Guerber moved to postpone discussion on the Westside Historic Inventory Permitted Interaction Group (PIG) until a future date of March or April 2022. Ms. Remoaldso seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.

Vice Chair Long moved that the commission work with staff on reviewing a HABS Historic American Building Survey document and develop an architectural document. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. Announcements</td>
<td>Ms. Valenciano said due to the current situation they would delay in-person meetings. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said they would continue teleconference for another two months and then reassess the situation. Ms. Valenciano alerted the commission they would receive an email based on today’s meeting and to confirm quorum for the next few months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics (February 17, 2022)</td>
<td>Next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, February 17, 2022&lt;br&gt;Agenda items;&lt;br&gt;1. Aloha Theatre – slightly different proposal&lt;br&gt;2. Pāʻulaʻula Russian Fort Elizabeth State Historical Park - improvements&lt;br&gt;3. Hanalei Bridge – Section 106 repair maintenance project&lt;br&gt;4. Zensai Kauaʻi - improvements</td>
<td>Mr. Guerber moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0. Chair Larson adjourned the meeting at 3:33pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Adjournment</td>
<td>With no further business to conduct, Chair Remoaldo called for a motion to adjourn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submitted by: ________________________________________
Sandra M. Muragin, Commission Support Clerk

Reviewed and Approved by: ________________________________________
Carolyn Larson, Chair

( ) Approved as circulated.
( ) Approved with amendments. See minutes of _____ meeting.
COUNTY OF KAUA‘I
Minutes of Meeting
OPEN SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Commission:</th>
<th>Kaua‘i Historic Preservation Review Commission</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>February 17, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Zoom Teleconference</td>
<td>Start of Meeting: 1:42 p.m.</td>
<td>End of Meeting: 3:28 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Call To Order</td>
<td>Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 1:42 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Roll Call</td>
<td>Deputy Director Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa verified attendance by roll call and requested a verbal response; Commissioner Guerber replied here. Commissioner Ida replied here. Commissioner Remoaldo replied here. Commissioner Summers replied here. Vice Chair Long replied here. Chair Larson replied present.</td>
<td>Quorum was established with six commissioners present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Approval of the Agenda</td>
<td>Ms. Summers dropped out of view at 1:43pm and did not vote verbally or by show of hand on the motion.</td>
<td>Mr. Guerber moved to approve the February 17, 2022 agenda, as circulated. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Approval of the Minutes</td>
<td>There were no minutes to approve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Communications</td>
<td>There were no communications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Public Comment</td>
<td>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa paused to allow anyone from the public to testify. Hearing none she moved to the next agenda item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Summers returned at 1:44 p.m. Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 1:45 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Consent Calendar</td>
<td>There were none.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Unfinished Business</td>
<td>There was no unfinished business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. New Business</td>
<td>Mr. Ida returned at 1:45 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.1. Hawaiʻi Department of Transportation Highways Division-Kauaʻi District Kūhiō Highway, Hanalei Bridge Repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Map Key: (4) 5-4-004:010; (4) 5-3-001:007; (4) 5-4-004:031; (4) 5-4-003:007; and the Right-of-way of Kūhiō Highway in the vicinity of these listed T MKs. National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian a. Director’s Report pertaining to this matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 1:46 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planner Marisa Valenciano shared the following;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The commission’s action for the project was to;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Provide information or knowledge of historical or cultural sites in the project area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Provide comments for a response letter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Defer comments until more information becomes available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Read portions of the Director’s Report dated February 17, 2022.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Ida returned at 1:47 p.m. Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 1:48 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ida returned at 1:49 p.m.</td>
<td>The department recommended the commission memorialize comments on specific information or knowledge and identify any historical or cultural sites within the project area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 1:49 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Fujikawa Hawai‘i Department of Transportation (HDOT) Highways Division and Project Manager, Kaua‘i District Engineer Larry Dill along with the design consultant team; KSF Inc. Structural &amp; Construction Engineering consultant Gary Iwamoto, and Guy Blanchard and Rachel Adams from WSP shared a power point presentation titled Hanalei River Bridge Rehabilitation Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reiterated that this project was independent and not part of last year’s presentation on the traffic signal improvements in the vicinity of Hanalei bridge. Main objective for today’s presentation was for maintenance and repair of the bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSP consultant Guy Blanchard shared bridge history:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Hanalei bridge was constructed in 1912 and had undergone numerous repairs and rehabilitation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 1978 the bridge was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP consultant Gary Iwamoto shared bridge inspection, proposed rehabilitation, and alternative to bridge closures: temporary bridge and detour;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Routine inspections uncovered corrosion and section loss, decay, and water stains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Proposed rehabilitation to refurbish, rust mitigation, replace damaged sections, clean and paint to prevent corrosion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To ease traffic and bridge closures they would construct a temporary bridge on the northside of the Hanalei bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Construction of the temporary bridge concrete pads would avoid any historic areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT | DISCUSSION | ACTION
--- | --- | ---
o Install temporary gabions on the side of Ohiki road that would be removed once work was completed.
- WSP consultant Rachel Adams shared federal requirements and section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended:
  o Federal funded project and would follow all federal requirements
  o They were now on step two which involved identification and evaluation of historic properties that may be in the area.
  o Next step would evaluate the information and conduct impact analysis and coordinate with State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) to develop a mitigation plan, if needed.

Kaua'i District Engineer Larry Dill clarified that they have not finalized their decision on constructing a temporary Acrow bridge. He said the other alternative was to have bridge closures; which would have a significant impact on traffic.

Questions:
1. Vice Chair Long brought up the issue with numerous highway signage around the historic bridge. He said the community was also annoyed and asked Mr. Kincaid to take out signage from a level one to level three. Mr. Dill acknowledged his concerns and there would be temporary bridge signs installed but it would be removed once the project was completed.
2. Chair Larson asked if signage was part of this project. Mr. Dill responded no. They planned temporary signage to alert drivers of the bridge repairs.
3. Mr. Guerber inquired if they would consider leaving the temporary bridge and could it be built to not remove. Mr. Dill replied that would not be an option and construction of a new bridge would require a much larger effort and scope of work.
4. Chair Larson asked if he knew of any plans in the future to add an additional bridge. Mr. Dill replied there were none.
5. Chair Larson asked if once the temporary bridge was removed would that include the concrete pilings. Mr. Iwamoto replied they would remove as much of the pilings as possible.
6. Chair Larson asked if the concrete pilings would remain. Mr. Iwamoto replied some of the concrete would remain in the area below the water level.
7. Ms. Remoaldo asked if the temporary bridge was installed would the gabions be placed in the riverbed and in a high-water event during the repairs would that affect the water spilling over into the valley. Mr. Dill responded the gabions would be used as a retaining wall to support the road and filled to raise Ohiki road and level it out with Kūhiō Highway.

8. Ms. Remoaldo asked if anything installed for the temporary bridge would impact the river flow. Mr. Dill responded the concrete shafts to support the temporary bridge would be up the riverbank on either side.

9. Ms. Summers stated the ring road was protected which would prohibit the installation of a temporary bridge. Mr. Dill acknowledged her point but it didn’t mean nothing could be done. If any changes were considered it would need to go through SHPD, community, Hawai‘i historic foundation and other interested parties.

10. Ms. Remoaldo asked if solar traffic lights were appropriate since the area rained often and was shaded. Ms. Rachel responded solar traffic lights was selected because it would not require trenching; however, they would check the feasibility of using solar.

11. Chair Larson asked if the temporary bridge would endanger the historic bridge in the event of a flood. Mr. Dill responded the historic bridge would not be adversely impacted by the temporary bridge in the event of a flood.

12. Chair Larson asked if the temporary bridge would be built above flood level. Mr. Iwamoto responded the temporary bridge would be elevated above the height of the historic bridge.

Chair Larson said the applicant wanted comments from the commission and asked if any were addressed that needed to be memorialized. There was no response from the commission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Ms. Remoaldo asked if the temporary bridge was installed would the gabions be placed in the riverbed and in a high-water event during the repairs would that affect the water spilling over into the valley. Mr. Dill responded the gabions would be used as a retaining wall to support the road and filled to raise Ohiki road and level it out with Kūhiō Highway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ms. Remoaldo asked if anything installed for the temporary bridge would impact the river flow. Mr. Dill responded the concrete shafts to support the temporary bridge would be up the riverbank on either side.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ms. Summers stated the ring road was protected which would prohibit the installation of a temporary bridge. Mr. Dill acknowledged her point but it didn’t mean nothing could be done. If any changes were considered it would need to go through SHPD, community, Hawai‘i historic foundation and other interested parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ms. Remoaldo asked if solar traffic lights were appropriate since the area rained often and was shaded. Ms. Rachel responded solar traffic lights was selected because it would not require trenching; however, they would check the feasibility of using solar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Chair Larson asked if the temporary bridge would endanger the historic bridge in the event of a flood. Mr. Dill responded the historic bridge would not be adversely impacted by the temporary bridge in the event of a flood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Chair Larson asked if the temporary bridge would be built above flood level. Mr. Iwamoto responded the temporary bridge would be elevated above the height of the historic bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Larson said the applicant wanted comments from the commission and asked if any were addressed that needed to be memorialized. There was no response from the commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair Long moved to accept and approve the Hawai‘i Department of Transportation Highways Division-Kaua‘i District Kūhiō Highway, Hanalei Bridge Repair, Tax Map Key: (4) 5-4-004:010; (4) 5-3-001:007; (4) 5-4-004:031; (4) 5-4-003:007; and the Right-of-way of Kūhiō</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## I.2. State of Hawai‘i Department of Land and Natural Resources-Division of State Parks

Pā‘ula‘ula/Russian Fort Elizabeth State Historical Park  
Tax Map Key: (4) 1-7-005:003  
Kona Moku, Makaweli Ahupua‘a  

Consideration of proposed improvements including a viewing platform, boardwalk, and repair and maintenance projects.  

- **Director’s Report pertaining to this matter.**  
  
  Ms. Valenciano shared the following:  
  - The commission’s action for the project was to;  
    - Support the project  
    - Recommend approval with conditions  
    - Recommend denial of permits  
    - Recommend defer action on the permits  
  - The park was split into two jurisdictions the state and county of Kaua‘i. The boardwalk and viewing platform were on state jurisdiction and the repair and maintenance sections were on county of Kaua‘i jurisdiction. The department requested the commission concentrate on the repair and maintenance sections that were under the jurisdiction of the county of Kaua‘i.  
  - The commission had the authority to review the project in its entirety; however, any comments on the boardwalk or viewing platform fell under the state and would be submitted to the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) who had the authority to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I.2. State of Hawai‘i Department of Land and Natural Resources-Division of State Parks Pā‘ula‘ula/Russian Fort Elizabeth State Historical Park | Consideration of proposed improvements including a viewing platform, boardwalk, and repair and maintenance projects.  
- **Director’s Report pertaining to this matter.**  
  
  Ms. Valenciano shared the following:  
  - The commission’s action for the project was to;  
    - Support the project  
    - Recommend approval with conditions  
    - Recommend denial of permits  
    - Recommend defer action on the permits  
  - The park was split into two jurisdictions the state and county of Kaua‘i. The boardwalk and viewing platform were on state jurisdiction and the repair and maintenance sections were on county of Kaua‘i jurisdiction. The department requested the commission concentrate on the repair and maintenance sections that were under the jurisdiction of the county of Kaua‘i.  
  - The commission had the authority to review the project in its entirety; however, any comments on the boardwalk or viewing platform fell under the state and would be submitted to the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) who had the authority to | Highways in the vicinity of these listed TMKs as presented with no comments from KHPRC. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Aye-5 (Mr. Ida held up a sign “Ae” to the camera, audio was not working). Nay-0 Abstain-1 (Guerber). Motion carried 5:0:1. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>incorporate their comments or not into the project.</td>
<td>Vice Chair Long walked out of view at 2:27 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Read portions of the Director’s Report dated February 17, 2022.</td>
<td>Vice Chair Long returned at 2:28 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Property was listed on the State and National Register of Historic Places, was over 50 years old and on the KHPRC inventory list.</td>
<td>Vice Chair Long walked out of view at 2:28 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The department recommends support for the proposed project.</td>
<td>Vice Chair Long returned at 2:28 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Architect Marc Ventura was the representative for the project and with him was Jessie Elliott. Questions:

1. Ms. Remoalado commented that the boardwalk and platform were made with material that allowed easy wheelchair access and complied with ADA (American with Disabilities Act). She asked if the coral pathway was ADA compliant. Mr. Ventura replied it fell within the accessibility guidelines. The board walk and platform material would be made using Trex® material and compared it to the Hāʻena state park boardwalk and transition onto a coral pathway.

2. Ms. Remoalado asked if the coral pathway would be affected and become unsafe if it rained.

Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:31 p.m.

Mr. Ventura responded the coral would be compacted into the dirt and should not get muddy.

3. Ms. Remoalado asked what drainage problems would be addressed because the parking lot ponds water.

Mr. Ida returned at 2:33 p.m.

Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:33 p.m.
Mr. Elliott responded that pending available funds they plan to resurface the parking lot and would replace a four-inch diameter drainage pipe with a concrete swell.

*Mr. Ida returned at 2:34 p.m.*

4. Ms. Remoaldo stated that “intent” and “where feasible” were used implying it was not concrete.

*Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:34 p.m.*

She said it was a concern to allow leeway in how the project would carry out.

*Mr. Ida returned at 2:34 p.m.*

Mr. Ventura said they have a budget to complete the whole project and from a budget standpoint they may not be able to achieve everything.

*Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:36 p.m. but audio worked, and he presented the following by audio only;* Mr. Ida referenced page 13, section M. Cultural it stated that “According to the State Archaeologist, DLNR, SHPD, a inventory survey level of study will not be required for this area. Due to the intensive activities previously conducted on the property, it is unlikely that the project area contains any cultural material or archaeological sites.” He had a problem with that statement that was listed in the Russian Fort Improvements report dated December 2021. Mr. Ida said the entire area was an archaeological site. Mr. Ida asked if the coral pathways or concrete blocks to support the boardwalk would it require grading or excavation. Mr. Ventura respectfully acknowledged his concerns and would try to minimize ground disturbance.

*Mr. Ida returned at 2:39 p.m.*

Mr. Ventura said the boardwalk would require footings and they would grade and excavate seven to twelve inches and for the coral pathway would be six to seven inches. Mr. Elliott replied they

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mr. Elliott responded that pending available funds they plan to resurface the parking lot and would replace a four-inch diameter drainage pipe with a concrete swell. | *Mr. Ida returned at 2:34 p.m.*

4. Ms. Remoaldo stated that “intent” and “where feasible” were used implying it was not concrete.

*Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:34 p.m.*

She said it was a concern to allow leeway in how the project would carry out.

*Mr. Ida returned at 2:34 p.m.*

Mr. Ventura said they have a budget to complete the whole project and from a budget standpoint they may not be able to achieve everything.

*Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:36 p.m. but audio worked, and he presented the following by audio only;* Mr. Ida referenced page 13, section M. Cultural it stated that “According to the State Archaeologist, DLNR, SHPD, a inventory survey level of study will not be required for this area. Due to the intensive activities previously conducted on the property, it is unlikely that the project area contains any cultural material or archaeological sites.” He had a problem with that statement that was listed in the Russian Fort Improvements report dated December 2021. Mr. Ida said the entire area was an archaeological site. Mr. Ida asked if the coral pathways or concrete blocks to support the boardwalk would it require grading or excavation. Mr. Ventura respectfully acknowledged his concerns and would try to minimize ground disturbance.

*Mr. Ida returned at 2:39 p.m.*

Mr. Ventura said the boardwalk would require footings and they would grade and excavate seven to twelve inches and for the coral pathway would be six to seven inches. Mr. Elliott replied they
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| were in contact with SHPD and take caution to minimize effects to the area. There would be state archaeologist onsite monitoring in the fort area.  
*Chair Larson dropped out of view at 2:40 p.m.*  
*Mr. Guerber walked out of view at 2:41 p.m.*  
*Chair Larson returned at 2:42 p.m.*  
Mr. Ida was suspicious that they would use a state archaeologist, state architect on state land. He said he was with Archaeologist Peter Mills when they examined the area and found cultural materials. He was told there may be bodies buried in the fort.  
*Mr. Guerber returned at 2:42 p.m.*  
Mr. Ida was doubtful that the area could be protected with SHPD’s response and unsure if Mr. Ventura could be trusted since they would disturb ground in an archaeological area.  
5. Chair Larson referenced page 32, section C. Cultural, “*Based on the above, a determination of “no historic properties affected” has been proposed.*” Mr. Ida did not agree with that finding and stated it would have an adverse effect and unsure how to mitigate the problem.  
Chair Larson asked if KHPRC could recommend archaeological monitoring. Mr. Ida was suspicious that it was a state project, on state land and they would have a state archaeologist monitory.  
*Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:44 p.m. but audio worked, and he presented the following by audio only;*  
He was adamant that there should be no ground disturbance.  
Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said KHPRC could request the department to draft a letter to DLNR stating their concerns and recommendations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ida returned at 2:47 p.m.</td>
<td>6. Vice Chair Long asked Mr. Ida if he would recommend onsite archaeologist outside of the state.</td>
<td>Mr. Long moved to accept the report on State of Hawai‘i’s and county of Kaua‘i and highly recommend and require onsite archaeological monitoring on any ground disturbance inside the Russian Fort area. Mr. Ida seconded the motion. (motion amended below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ida dropped out of view and returned at 2:48 p.m. several times.</td>
<td>Mr. Ida responded a strong recommendation for onsite monitoring on any ground disturbance inside the fort. He was not concerned on any excavation outside the fort.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:49 p.m.</td>
<td>Mr. Long commented that Marc Ventura was a highly respected architect on Kaua‘i and would make every effort, within budget, to ensure the project was carried out correctly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ida returned at 2:50 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:51 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ida returned at 2:51 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Larson asked if the commission had any comments on the repair and maintenance sections that were on county of Kaua‘i jurisdiction. She said Ms. Remoaldo pointed out drainage in the parking lot. Mr. Ida had no concerns with the area outside the fort and the rest of the commission did not have any comments either. Chair Larson asked if an amendment to the motion could be made to include planning department staff draft a letter of their concerns to SHPD. Ms. Valenciano clarified that the department would draft a letter on behalf of KHP RC to the state DLNR and asked the commission to confirm this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:53 p.m.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Mr. Ida returned at 2:53 p.m.</strong></td>
<td>The commission agreed and Mr. Long requested the letter state that it be required not suggested. <strong>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:54 p.m.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Mr. Ida returned at 2:54 p.m.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mr. Long moved to accept the State and County of Kaua‘i project for the State of Hawai‘i’s report from Marc Ventura AIA, LLC dated December 2021 titled Russian Fort Improvements Petition for: Class IV Zoning Permit dated December 2021, and the Department of Planning’s Director’s Report dated February 17, 2022 on the State of Hawai‘i Department of Land and Natural Resources-Division of State Parks Pā'ula’ula/Russian Fort.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Valenciano confirmed with the commission that the department would draft a letter on behalf of KHPRC to the state DLNR on their required comments and there were no comments on the county of Kaua‘i repair and maintenance projects. <strong>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:56 p.m.</strong></td>
<td>Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall said he summed up the request that KHPRC accepts and approves the report with the condition that there be a requirement for onsite monitoring during any ground disturbance inside the fort.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ida returned at 2:56 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth State Historical Park Tax Map Key: (4) 1-7-005:003 Kona Moku, Makaweli Ahupua‘a, Consideration of proposed improvements including a viewing platform, boardwalk, and repair and maintenance projects and require onsite archaeological monitoring on any ground disturbance inside the Russian Fort area and requested the planning department draft a letter to SHPD regarding their decision and requirements. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Aye-6 Nay-0. Motion carried 6:0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. L. Shimokawa-Zensai Kauaʻi (formerly known as the Kauaʻi Pupu Factory Building) Property Address: 1-3566 Kaumualiʻi Hwy, Hanapēpē Tax Map Key: (4) 1-9-010:013 Hanapēpē, Hawaiʻi Consideration of a Class 1 Zoning Permit for the proposed enclosure of an existing carport area for the conversion to a retail shop. a. Director’s Report pertaining to this matter. Ms. Valenciano shared the following; • The commission’s action for the project was to; o Support the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| o Recommend to the department to approve any zoning permits with conditions  
| o Recommend to the department to consider denial of permits  
| o Recommend to the department to defer action on the permits | | |
| • Read portions of the Director’s Report dated February 17, 2022.  
| • Property was fifty years old and on the KHPRC list.  
| • The department recommends support for the project as represented. | | |

Lori Shimokawa, the owner, did not have a presentation.

*Vice Chair long dropped out of view at 3:03 p.m.*

Questions:

1. Mr. Ida asked what was holding the carport roof. Ms. Shimokawa replied that her contractor George Kawamura would construct a new structure around the roof.

*Vice Chair long returned at 3:03 p.m.*  
*Vice Chair long dropped out of view at 3:04 p.m.*

Ms. Valenciano clarified that two metal columns kept the roof propped up.

2. Mr. Ida asked which part of the building was being enclosed. Ms. Valenciano replied it was the right side of the building.

*Vice Chair long returned at 3:06 p.m.*

3. Chair Larson asked when the left side was enclosed and what exterior material was used.

*Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 3:06 p.m.*

Ms. Shimokawa replied it was enclosed when pupu factory took over approximately 17 to 20 years ago.

4. Chair Larson asked who occupied the building prior to pupu factory. Ms. Shimokawa said
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it was radiator shop owned by Mr. Harper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mr. Ida returned at 3:07 p.m.*

5. Chair Larson asked if the radiator shop enclosed the left side. Ms. Shimokawa replied yes, and pupu factory remodeled the space into a kitchen.

6. Chair Larson asked if the middle section the concrete part of the building was original. Ms. Valenciano replied a 1994 survey mentioned the concrete section was original. There was no information about the left kitchen side so it could be a later addition.

7. Chair Larson asked about the kitchen side exterior surface; tongue and groove (t&g) or plywood t&g. Ms. Valenciano was not sure.

*Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 3:10 p.m.*

Chair Larson asked if anyone else had concerns with the use of plywood t&g in the new addition instead of using the same exterior material that was on the left side addition. No one responded.

*Mr. Ida returned at 3:11 p.m.*

8. Vice Chair Long asked for the exterior surface treatment on the existing building. Ms. Valenciano replied the elevations show plywood t&g.

9. Ms. Remoaldo said the drawings did not have a date and asked if the commercial use of the building was still valid. *No answer because Ms. Valenciano answered Vice Chair Long’s question #8 that was delayed because she had to research the answer.*

Chair Larson asked if the addition should match the material and style to the original which was use real t&g or board batten. Ms. Summers replied that additions should look like a new addition and the enclosure exterior would match the exterior of the kitchen side. Ms. Valenciano reiterated that it didn’t have to replicate the original, but the owner wanted it to match the other side, the kitchen addition side.

10. Vice Chair Long asked if the existing building was plywood t&g. Ms. Valenciano
replied she could not confirm but the middle part of the building was concrete, the left side addition exterior was t&g and the right-side exterior would be plywood t&g. Ms. Shimokawa commented that they would match the addition exterior to the kitchen side exterior.

*Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 3:17 p.m.*

10. Ms. Remoaldo said her question wasn’t asked…there was no date on the drawings and asked if the vape shop would still occupy the proposed addition. Ms. Shimokawa said the plan was to use it for a vape shop, but the shop owner was in a recent accident and now she wasn’t sure.

*Mr. Ida returned at 3:19 p.m.*

Ms. Summers commented that the kitchen side looked like plywood t&g and it continued on top of the middle section below the roof.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. General Business</td>
<td>There were none.</td>
<td>Mr. Guerber moved to support the L. Shimokawa-Zensai Kaua‘i (formerly known as the Kaua‘i Pupu Factory Building) Property Address: 1-3566 Kaumuali‘i Hwy, Hanapēpē Tax Map Key: (4) 1-9-010:013 Hanapēpē, Hawai‘i Consideration of a Class 1 Zoning Permit for the proposed enclosure of an existing carport area for the conversion to a retail shop. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Aye-6 Nay-0. Motion carried 6:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. Announcements</strong></td>
<td>Ms. Valenciano announced a Historic Hawai‘i Foundation Zoom training on Wednesday, March 2, 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. regarding flood adaptation for historic buildings. Register in advance if you plan to attend and Ms. Valenciano will email a link. Call main line 241-4050 for computer assistance. She said it was difficult for Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa or herself to answer a phone call in the middle of a meeting. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa announced that the legislature planned to return to in-person meetings next month which would trigger possible in-person KHPRC meetings in April. She would keep everyone informed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **L. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics** (March 17, 2022) | Next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, March 17, 2022  
Agenda items;  
1. Programmatic Agreement  
2. Douglas Baldwin Beach House garage alternative  
3. KHPRC rule amendments  
4. HABS (Historic American Building Survey) like document |        |
| **M. Adjournment**      | With no further business to conduct, Chair Larson called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Ida moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0. Chair Larson adjourned the meeting at 3:28pm |        |
( ) Approved as circulated.
( ) Approved with amendments. See minutes of _____ meeting.
Kaua‘i County Historic Preservation Review Commission (KHPRC)

SUPPLEMENTAL #3 TO THE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

I. SUMMARY

Action Required by KHPRC:

a. Section 106 request to provide comments regarding a draft programmatic agreement.

KHPRC actions may include the following:

b. Provide comments on the draft programmatic agreement and supplemental documents.

c. Defer and withhold comments until future drafts of the programmatic agreement becomes available.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Programmatic Agreement for Minor Hawai‘i Historic Bridges Projects (PA) will set forth a process by which the FHWA will meet, with the assistance of the HDOT, SHPD and Counties, its responsibilities for historic bridges that: (l) achieves safe and efficient transportation operations; (2) avoids, minimizes, and mitigates adverse effects on historic bridges; and (3) makes efficient use of federal aid in historic bridge maintenance, repair and minor rehabilitation by developing a Section 106 process that: (a) simplifies procedural requirements, and (b) reduces the project-by-project review role of SHPD by focusing time and attention on projects that warrant their oversight and attention.

III. PROJECT BACKGROUND

Following the January 27, 2022 KHPRC meeting, the Department received written comments from Chair Larson (see attached Exhibit A). The current comments are in draft form and are intended to be used for discussion purposes. The Department would like the opportunity to finalize the comments with Chair Larson and then transmit the final draft to the agency for their review.

A summary of this agenda item is provided in the table below:
IV. RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Department recommends that the Kaua‘i Historic Preservation Review Commission receives Exhibit A for the record and transmits a final draft of comments along with any other additional written comments provided by the KHPRC.

The Commission is further advised that this report does not represent the Planning Department’s final recommendation in view of the forthcoming public hearing process whereby the entire record should be considered prior to decision making. The entire record includes but is not limited to:
a. Government agency comments;

b. Testimony from the general public and interested others; and

c. The land owner's response.

By _________________________________
MARISA VALENCIANO
Planner

Approved & Recommended to Commission:

By _________________________________
JODI A. HIGUCHI SAYAGUSA
Deputy Director of Planning

Date: 3-7-2022
EXHIBIT “A”

(Chair Larson’s Draft Comments for HDOT PA)
Sec. 106 HDOT Programmatic Agreement For Minor Repairs to Historic Bridges
Kauai Historic Preservation Review Commission Comments

Document: Glossary

- Is there a difference between “Buffer” vs. “Structure Zone”
- Add “SHPO”


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line/Paragraph Number</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Comment/ Proposed Revision</th>
<th>Action Taken/ Response (FOR HDOT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Who are qualified professionals? Describe what constitutes a qualified professional. Either here or in the glossary?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paragraph 1</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Spell out the following acronyms for the first time it is introduced in the document:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- FHWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- HDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SHPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paragraph 1</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Correct the first sentence to say “…and Counties, its responsibilities for historic bridges in a way that: achieves safe”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paragraph 1</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Add “Counties” in the sentence “…project-by-project review role of SHPD and counties by”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 | 1 | 2 | In the first sentence of the second paragraph, is it supposed to be State Historic Bridge List?  
“The Agreement applies to historic bridges and structures listed on the State Historic Bridge List;” |
| 6 | 1 | 2 | Revise the sentence below to improve flow:  
“It exempts from further review ground-disturbing activities within a strict 10-foot buffer zone, presumed to be previously disturbed by the initial bridge construction, as measured from the edge of the superstructure and substructure of the existing historic bridge or [structure from further review].” |
| 7 | 1 | 3 | Suggest the sentence say:  
“Together, [they] the best practices provide a framework and guidance for decision-making...” |
| 8 | 1 | 4 | Suggest you revise the first sentence as follows:  
“The Agreement applies only to the Tiered Activities for Historic Bridge Minor Projects. Project Manager(s) or Qualified Professional(s) (in accordance with Stipulation 3.A) following the Project Review process outlined in the Agreement, may make a determination that an undertaking is an activity that has no potential to cause effect or no adverse effect on bridges and structures on the Historic Bridge List.” |
| 9 | 1 | 4 | Is it supposed to be “cause effect” or have a different term?” |
“...Agreement may make a determination that an undertaking is an activity that has no potential to cause effect? or no adverse effect on bridges and structures on the Historic Bridge List.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th><strong>KHPRC</strong> (C. Larson)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Revise to say:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“If the project does not meet the terms and conditions outlined in the Tiered Activities List...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Revise the sentence and spell out NHPA:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Tier 1 Activities that have No Potential to Cause Effects to historic properties, therefore the activity may proceed with no further review under this Agreement and the [NHPA] National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Add “Tier 2” to the beginning of the paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It should read:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“<strong>Tier 2</strong> Activities with Potential Effects but No Adverse Effects...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>What is the Certification Form? Reference where a copy can be found?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Is it supposed to be “SHPO” or “SHPD”?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is “SHPO” in the glossary?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line/ Paragraph Number</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Comment/ Proposed Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1   | N/A  | N/A                    | KHPRC (C. Larson) | General Comments applicable to all Chapters  
  - **Use consistency of tense to describe activities under each tier.** For example, using present tense such as “scrape, remove, clear, use”  
  - **Use term “Best Practices”** - Integrating the term “use best practices” in each of the sections. I noted some areas where best practices exist but are not referenced, but there are other areas where I hope there are best practices in place to refer to but don’t know if they exist yet. | |
<p>| 2   | N/A  | 1.1.1 Vegetation on or Within Structures Tier 2 | KHPRC (C. Larson) | Question: What is the effect or herbicides on metal or concrete? Are there negative effects of herbicides, cleaning products or other products used on metal, concrete, wood or other bridge materials? If so we should reference using appropriate products for the structural elements. | |
| 3   | N/A  | 1.1.1 Vegetation on or Within Structures Tier 2 | KHPRC (C. Larson) | Revise to say: “Removing roots...” | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1.1.2. Vegetation Adjacent to Structures Tier 2</th>
<th>KHPRC (C. Larson)</th>
<th>Revise to include “use best arboriculture practices” Possible suggestion: “<em>Use best arboriculture practices to clear intrusive and overhang branches from alongside and overhead of bridge structure.</em>”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.2.1 Stream Diversion Tier 1</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Please clarify language for this activity that says: “Removal of snags and loose vegetation from waterway in order to alleviate flooding or erosion which may endanger bridge structure. All work must be within the 10’-10” buffer zone.” I was meaning that all vegetation does not need to be removed, in fact it better represents the historic character of the area if the vegetation remains, but any live or dead vegetation that threatens the bridge or compromised human safety should be removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.2.2 Channel Lining and Scour Protection Tier 3</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Is there a definition in the glossary for “Channel Lining”? Under Tier 3, can you require attention to the design aesthetics as well as historic character of the new scour? Would it belong here or somewhere else? Possible Recommendation: “Placement <em>and aesthetics</em> of a new scour protection within the 10’-0” bridge buffer zone and requiring no ground disturbance or excavation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.2.3 Micropile Installation</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Is there a definition in the glossary for “micropile”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8  | N/A | 1.3 Laydown Areas              |                   | It would be helpful to include a general illustration showing different parts of the bridge including but not limited to laydown areas, etc.  
This would be a helpful visual reference. |
| 9  | N/A | 1.3 Laydown Areas Tier 1       | KHPRC (C. Larson) | Add reference to (properly storing) toxic materials for laydown areas.  
Also add reference to toxic materials in other applicable sections. |
| 10 | N/A | 1.5.2 Utilities Attached to Bridge Tier 2 and Tier 3 | KHPRC (C. Larson) | Under the Tier 2 and Tier 3 activity description, please clarify language as to whether it includes the same utility route or the relocation of a new utility route.  
Would the relocation of a new utility route trigger Tier 4? |
| 11 | N/A | 2.2.1 Stone Masonry Cleaning General and Tier 2 | KHPRC (C. Larson) | Is it possible to leave non-threatening vegetation that gives it that patina look?  
Under Tier 2 activity description, could it be revised to say:  
“Removal of moss, dirt, and loose leaves and branches (also see Section 1.1.1) if it is threatening structure or becomes a safety concern.” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2.3.1 Concrete Cleaning Tier 3</th>
<th>KHPRC (C. Larson)</th>
<th>Would certain kinds of tools (i.e. more intrusive) require a higher tier review versus other tools that may be less intrusive? We talk about products that can potentially harm the bridge but what about tools or machinery and their techniques?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.4 Rivet and Bolted Connections Tier 2</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Spelling Error Should be: “In-kind”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2 Surface Sealing Concrete Tier 2 and Tier 3</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Under Tier 2 and Tier 3 activity descriptions, it states “application of sealer to existing wearing surface...” Are there “approved” types of sealant? Are certain sealants more appropriate than others? Best Practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.1 Bridge Railing and Parapet Repairs Stone Tier 2 and Tier 3</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Can you please clarify if the activity includes both the repair/ replacement and the repointing? For example, should it be clarified to say the following: “Repair or re-placement of dislodged individual stones with (existing?) same material. And/ or repointing using mortar matching existing characteristics of type, color, strength, and tooling.” It appears that at least one of the two activities mentioned in this box will trigger the Tier review. Can you please clarify?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.2.1 Reinforced Concrete</td>
<td>KHPRC (C. Larson)</td>
<td>Delete one row. Duplicate items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **17** | N/A | 4.3.1 Material Sampling and testing Masonry Tier 2 | KHPRC (C. Larson) | ? on “Remove a portion of the stone unit or masonry unit for strength and material verification”
Question- how does the process work? |
| **18** | N/A | 4.3.2 Concrete Tier 2 | KHPRC (C. Larson) | Should the area of the core drilling for concrete strength be patched after? |
| **19** | N/A | 4.3.2 Concrete | KHPRC (C. Larson) | Can this section somehow reference and encourage the Non-destructive concrete testing methods as listed in Section 4.4.1 Tier 2? Section 4.3.2 and 4.4.1 are related. |
| **20** | N/A | 6.2.1 Freestanding Signage Tier 1-4 | KHPRC (C. Larson) | As drafted, the current activities include repair or replacement of existing signage or adding new signage, but can there be language added in one of the tiers to include “evaluate existing signage for consideration to remove or relocate.” |
| **21** | N/A | N/A | KHPRC (C. Larson) | Can you add a materials section? |
Mr. Kaaina Hull  
Director of Planning  
Planning Department  
County of Kauai  
4444 Rice Street, Suite 473  
Lihue, Kauai, Hawaii 96766

Re:  Class I Zoning Permit Application  
Renovation of the Accessory Garage Structure  
to the Douglas Baldwin Beach House  
Lot 1-B (1.263 acres)  
5242 Weke Road, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii  
Kauai Tax Map Key No. (4) 5-5-002:107  
Owner/Applicant: 3 Palms, LLC

Dear Mr. Hull:

This office represents 3 Palms, LLC, a California limited liability company (referred to as the "Applicant"). This letter is in response to the conditions noted in the Planning Department Memorandum, dated February 15, 2022, regarding the action taken on January 27, 2022, by the Kauai Historic Preservation Review Commission ("KHPRC") recommending approval of the Class I Zoning Permit to renovate the existing garage associated with the Douglas Baldwin Beach House. (See, Exhibit “A”).

The proposed renovation of the Douglas Baldwin Beach House is pending review as Building Permit No. 21-934. As discussed during the review by the KHPRC, the Applicant commits to soften the edges of the lava rock wall around the outdoor shower area; however, the drafting program illustrates only hard cornered walls. The Applicant will soften the edges of the lava rock walls as requested by the KHPRC. Further, the Applicant has evaluated other historic plantation garage door paneling in and around Hanalei and has revised the plan set to alter the garage door paneling to vertical paneling rather than horizontal paneling. (See, Exhibit “B,” sheet AO1).
As such, the proposed renovation of the existing accessory garage structure further preserves the historically integrity of the accessory garage structure to the Douglas Baldwin Beach House and the Applicant requests that the KHPRC approve the proposed revisions to the garage door paneling.

If you have any questions or require anything further in this regard, please do not hesitate to contact me at (808) 245-2163.

Sincerely yours,

BELLES GRAHAM LLP

[Signature]

IKJ:jaug
Enclosures
cc:   Ms. Bristol King, w/encls. (via email only)
      Mr. Romio Idica, SMA Planner, w/encls. (via email only)
      Ms. Marissa Valenciano, Historic Planner, w/encls. (via email only)
      Mr. Mark Eyler, w/encls. (via email only)
EXHIBIT "A"
MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 15, 2022
TO: Dale Cua, Planning Department – Regulatory Division
FROM: Kauai Historic Preservation Review Commission

SUBJECT: Kaua‘i Historic Preservation Review Commission Action for:
3 Palms, LLC- Douglas Baldwin Beach House
Proposed Improvements to renovate the existing garage accessory
structure and to construct a new outdoor shower in proximity to the
garage
Property Address: 5242 Weke Road, Hanalei
TMK: (4) 5-5-002:107
HPRC-2022-13
Class I Zoning Permit Z-297-2022

This letter memorializes the action taken by the Kauai Historic Preservation Review
Commission (KHPRC) effective January 27, 2022 concerning approval for a new
zoning permit to renovate the existing garage on the subject property. In addition to
renovating the garage, the proposed improvements include the addition of a new
outdoor shower to be constructed in proximity to the garage.

The KHPRC voted to SUPPORT the proposed project with the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall ensure that the architectural form, style, and material used for the proposed
improvements is consistent with the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards & Guidelines, and
does not detract from or significantly alter the historic integrity of the existing property and the
historic beach house.

2. Applicant shall be cognizant that KHPRC review and approval shall not obviate the Applicant
or permit application submittal from the standard regulatory permitting review process and
the permitting requirements set forth in the applicable State and County laws, including but
not limited to the County of Kaua‘i Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance.

3. Applicant shall be cognizant of the HRS 6E-10 review process as it pertains to privately
owned properties listed on the Hawai‘i or National Registers of Historic Places. The
Applicant shall formally contact SHPD and comply with any conditions or agency comments.
4. Prior to issuance of the new permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the Department to confirm compliance with any EIS/EA requirement pursuant to HRS 343.

**In addition, KHPRC recommended two mitigating considerations:**

1. Work with the contractor and installer to soften the shape of the lava rock wall; and

2. The garage doors be brought back to KHPRC at a future meeting for review and consideration.

Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Mahalo,

Jodi A. Higuchi Sayegusa
Clerk of the Kaua’i Historic Preservation Review Commission

Cc: Mr. Ian Jung, Applicant’s Representative  
Mr. David Buckley, SHPD  
Mr. Romio Idica, County of Kaua’i CZM Planner
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1. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

2. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

3. All dimensions shown are to be referenced with the foundation plan and cross-referenced with field measurements or specifications. The architect shall notify the contractor of the accuracy of the dimensions. Failure to notify the architect of the accuracy of the dimensions shall result in a default of the contract for any error in the construction.

4. Any errors or omissions contained herein are to be immediately reported to the architect of the job by the owner or contractor.

5. All construction to meet all applicable national, state, and local codes. Should any code deficiency appear within drawings or specifications the contractor shall notify the architect of the accuracy of the dimensions.

6. The owner shall notify the architect of the accuracy of the dimensions and site conditions prior to construction.

7. The contractor shall verify all dimensions and site conditions prior to starting construction.

8. All electrical conduits to be routed above floor framing and electrical systems to be coordinated with other trades.

9. The structural engineers represent the finished structure. ANY AMENDMENTS TO THE STRUCTURE DURING CONSTRUCTION SUCH AS BRACING AND SHADING FOR GULAGS DUE TO LIMITATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE, 2006, AS AMENDED BY THE COUNTY OF KAUAI, AND ALL APPLICABLE BUILDING CODES, CODES, AND ORDINANCES.

10. Test and inspection shall be performed at the request of the owner or contractor.

11. Work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

12. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

13. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

14. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

15. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

16. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

17. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

18. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

19. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

20. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

21. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

22. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

23. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

24. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

25. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

26. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

27. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

28. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

29. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

30. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

31. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

32. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

33. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

34. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

35. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.

36. The architect of all contracts prior to performing the work shall:

   a. Estimate the cost, time, and materials required for the work.
   b. Establish the time for the completion of the work.
   c. Establish the schedule for the work.

37. All work shall conform to the International Building Code, 2006, as amended by the County of Kauai, and all applicable building codes, codes, and ordinances. Incidence of any conflict within the methods or standards of installation on the material specified do not equal or exceed the requirements of the laws, or ordinances. The laws, or ordinances shall govern.
CONCRETE

1. SHALL BE MADE WITH PORTLAND CEMENT ASTM C-150 TYPE I OR II, COARSE AND FINE AGGREGATE AS SPECIFIED. WATER CLEAN AND POTABLE, AND FREE FROM ALL TOXIC SUBSTANCES. ADD TO CONCRETE AS DIRECTED BY THE MANUFACTURER, IN VOLUME, CONFORMING TO ASTM C-29. NO ALUMINA (CONCUMBENT) OR EQUIVALENT MATERIALS, ETC. SHALL BE ADDED TO ANY CONCRETE.

2. DESIGN CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE LOCATIONS OF ALL ANCHORS, INSERTS, ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL, WORK PORE TO POURING CONCRETE.

3. ALL CONCRETE SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM 28 DAY COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH OF 3,000 PSI UNLESS OTHERWISE APPROVED.

4. MAXIMUM WATER CEMENT RATIO FOR ALL CONCRETE USED IN THE PROJECT SHALL NOT EXCEED 0.60.

5. WATER CEMENT RATIO CALCULATION SHALL INCLUDE A MAXIMUM OF 5% DRY SOIL CONDITONS ARE ENCOUNTERED DURING EXCAVATION FOR THE FOUNDATION. ADD TO ALL CONCRETE EXPOSED TO WEATHER AN AIR COMPRRESSED AIR TO REMOVE ALL WATER, PREPARE CONCRETE AND EXPAND THE CONCRETE PER MANUFACTURER'S PUBLISHED RECOMMENDATIONS.

REINFORCING

1. REINFORCING STEEL SHALL CONFORM TO ASTM A-615, INCLUDING SUPPLEMENT Y, GRADE 50 @ 60,000 PSI. WELDED WIRE FABRIC SHALL CONFORM TO ASTM A-440, SUPPLEMENTAL R, GRADE 50 @ 60,000 PSI.

2. REINFORCING STEEL SHALL BE DETAILLED INCLUDING HOOKS AND BENDS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM A-615. ALL NON-CONTINUOUS REINFORCEMENT 1/2" BAR DIAMETERS OR LESS CAN BE USED, PROVIDED CONFORMS TO ALL, VAL, AND FOOTINGS INTERSECTIONS. LAP CORNERS 6 BAR DIAMETERS OR 2" MIN. LAP CORNERS 6 BAR DIAMETERS OR 2" MIN.

3. PROTECTION COVER FOR REINFORCING CONCRETE SHALL BE AS FOLLOWS: FOOTINGS AND OTHER UNFORMED SURFACES SHALL BE 1’ MIN. 2'-0" MINIMUM. LAP ADJACENT MATS OF WELDED MRE FABRIC A MINIMUM OF 8" AT SIDES AND ENDS. PROVIDE CORNER BARS AT ALL WALL EDGES AND INTERSECTIONS.

ANCHORAGE

1. EPOXY-COATINGS ITEMS SPECIFIED ON THE DRAWINGS SHALL BE EPOXY-COATINGS ITEM SPECIFIED ON THE DRAWINGS.

WOOD AND FRAMING

1. ALL FRAMING MEMBERS SHALL BE DOUGLAS PINE OR SPRUCE, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. ALL GUM LUMBER SHALL BE DOUGLAS PINE GRADE 24A UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. ALL FISHING LUMBER, BLOCKING, PLACING, SHAVING AND CONCEALER LUMBER SHALL BE PRESSURE TREATED. ALL COMPOSITE 2x4s SHALL BE DOUGLAS PINE #1 AND #2 UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. EXTENDER HARDNER OPENINGS OVER 1/2" WIDE SHALL HAVE STRAPPING AT EACH END FROM OVERLAY TO EXISTING LUMBER AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

2. FOLLOW BC-200 FOR NAILING SCHEDULE MINIMUM US. NOTCH DRIED IN GAZED NAILS ONLY. MOST ROUGH HARDWARE TO USE THE LARGEST HOLE AVAILABLE FOR THE MEMBERS INVOLVED. NOTCHES FOR HAng HARDWARE TO BE CLEANED AND PAINTED BEFORE INSERTING. TOUCH UP AFT. STRAIGHT NAILS TO BE USED IN EXPOSED AND HARDWARE, UNLESS APPROVED BY ARCHITECT.
Kaua‘i County Historic Preservation Review Commission (KHPRC)

SUPPLEMENTAL #1 TO THE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

I. SUMMARY

Action Required by KHPRC:

- Review and comment on an alternative garage door as a follow up to KHPRC’s recommendation of support concerning the renovation of the garage accessory structure.

KHPRC actions may include the following:

1) Support for the project; or
2) A recommendation to the Planning Department that its approval of any zoning permit should incorporate conditions of approval; or
3) A recommendation to the Planning Department to consider denial of the permit(s); or
4) A recommendation to defer action on the permits.

II. PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Location:</th>
<th>5242 Weke Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanalei, Kaua‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Map Key(s):</td>
<td>(4) 5-5-002:107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area:</td>
<td>1.2630 Acres/55,016 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Structures:</td>
<td>According to the Real Property Tax Assessment, there is one structure on the property that was built in 1928 and is estimated to be approximately 94 years old.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAND USE DESIGNATIONS & VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning:</th>
<th>Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Land Use District:</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Designation:</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner(s):</td>
<td>3 Palms, LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
January 27, 2022 KHPRC Meeting
At the January 27, 2022 meeting, the applicant presented proposed plans to renovate an existing garage and to construct a new outdoor shower. During the meeting, the KHPRC voted to support the proposed project with the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall ensure that the architectural form, style, and material used for the proposed improvements is consistent with the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards & Guidelines, and does not detract from or significantly alter the historic integrity of the existing property and the historic beach house.

2. Applicant shall be cognizant that KHPRC review and approval shall not obviate the Applicant or permit application submittal from the standard regulatory permitting review process and the permitting requirements set forth in the applicable State and County laws, including but not limited to the County of Kaua‘i Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance.

3. Applicant shall be cognizant of the HRS 6E-10 review process as it pertains to privately owned properties listed on the Hawai‘i or National Registers of Historic Places. The Applicant shall formally contact SHPD and comply with any conditions or agency comments.

4. Prior to issuance of the new permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the Department to confirm compliance with any EIS/EA requirement pursuant to HRS 343.

In addition, KHPRC recommended two mitigating considerations:

1. Work with the contractor and installer to soften the shape of the lava rock wall; and

2. The garage doors be brought back to KHPRC at a future meeting for review and consideration.

March 17, 2022 KHPRC Meeting
In follow up to KHPRC’s recommendation, the applicant is now presenting an alternative to the horizontal accordion doors that were presented at the January 27, 2022 meeting. In the original preliminary plans, the applicant proposed to replace the existing lattice garage doors with a rectangle, horizontal accordion panel door. The proposed doors prompted discussion on whether the doors were
compatible and in keeping with the historic integrity of the structure. KHPRC requested for the applicant to explore alternative garage doors based on other historic plantation-style garage style doors in Hanalei Town.

In the revised plans, the applicant is now proposing to install vertical panel doors based on an evaluation of other historic plantation garage doors in and around Hanalei. A comparison of the horizontal versus the vertical panel doors is provided in Exhibit A.

IV. TRIGGER FOR KHPRC REVIEW

- This project triggers the KHPRC review as the structure is over fifty years old and is listed on the Hawai‘i Register of Historic Places.

V. EVALUATION

- As represented by the applicant, there are no historical photos to confirm what the original garage doors looked like. The applicant previously explained at the last meeting that the existing lattice doors appear to have been added around the 1980s.

- The proposed vertical panel doors are an improvement to the previous horizontal panel doors and will be in keeping with the plantation-style character of the main house and other historic homes in the surrounding area.

- The garage renovations will preserve the garage structure that was previously proposed to be demolished. The applicant, where possible, is utilizing in-kind replacement materials and is following the guidelines of the Secretary of Interior Standards. It is the Department’s position that the proposed renovations to the garage structure should not detract from the historic integrity of the subject property.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Department recommends that the Kaua‘i Historic Preservation Review Commission SUPPORT the vertical panel garage doors as represented.

It should be noted that the Applicant should continue to adhere to all the other previous recommendations and conditions that were mentioned during the January 27, 2022 KHPRC meeting.
The Commission is further advised that this report does not represent the Planning Department’s final recommendation in view of the forthcoming public hearing process whereby the entire record should be considered prior to decision making. The entire record includes but is not limited to:

a. Government agency comments;

b. Testimony from the general public and interested others; and

c. The land owner’s response.

By _________________________________
MARISA VALENCIANO
Planner

Approved & Recommended to Commission:

By _________________________________
JODI A. HIGUCHI SAYAGUSA
Deputy Director of Planning

Date: 3/4/2022
EXHIBIT “A”
(Garage Door Comparison)
## Douglas Baldwin Beach House- Garage Door Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>KHPRC Meeting</th>
<th>Paneling Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2022</td>
<td>KHPRC Meeting</td>
<td>Horizontal, rectangle paneling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17, 2022</td>
<td>KHPRC Meeting</td>
<td>Vertical Paneling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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