

COUNTY OF KAUAI
Minutes of Meeting
OPEN SESSION

DRAFT To Be Approved

Board/Commission:	Kauai Historic Preservation Review Commission	Meeting Date	July 21, 2022
Location	Mo'ikeha 2A/2B with remote access by Zoom Teleconference and Audio Connection	Start of Meeting: 1:30 p.m.	End of Meeting: 4:59 p.m.
Present	Chair Carolyn Larson. Vice Chair Stephen Long. Commissioners: James Guerber, Gerald Ida, Susan Remoaldo and Aubrey Summers (<i>attended by Zoom</i>). Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall (<i>attended by Zoom</i>). Planning Department Staff: Director Ka'aina Hull, Planner Marisa Valenciano, Planner Myles Hironaka (<i>attended by Zoom</i>), and Commission Support Clerk Kristen Romuar Cabico. Office of Boards and Commissions: Administrator Ellen Ching, and Commission Support Clerk Lisa Oyama.		
Excused	Commission Support Clerk Sandra Muragin		
Absent			

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<i>**As a disclosure, the Marantz recorder was improperly setup, and barely captured the commissions and agencies conversations which made it difficult to accurately document. There were pockets of conversation that was inaudible and not included in the minutes. Also, the Zoom recording was not saved.**</i>	
A. Call To Order	Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.	
B. Roll Call	Director Ka'aina Hull 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 here.	Quorum was established with six commissioners present.
C. Approval of the Agenda		Mr. Guerber moved to approve the July 21, 2022 agenda, as circulated. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>D. Approval of the Minutes</p>	<p>1. April 21, 2022</p> <p>Ms. Remoaldo requested a correction on page 4, the seventh bullet under questions. She said it should be clearer and should identify the two Wailua river bridges instead of just the mayor Baptiste bridge. Mr. Hull replied that the minutes reflect an accurate statement of what was said at the meeting. He recommended leaving that portion as is. She also requested a correction on page 6, third bullet. Ms. Remoaldo stated she did not remember saying that, and it was not what she meant. She requested to delete “historic area disturbed and did not want the area repaved” and replace with “stone columns and fence rails impacted by any repaving activities”.</p> <p>Chair Larson requested a correction on page 7, under action, replace “Open Space” with “the Kaua’i Historic Preservation Review Commission”; page 9, second bullet, replace “was” with “were” and page 9, fourth bullet, replace “transit” with “transom”</p> <p>With no further discussion from the commission, Chair Larson asked for a motion to approve the amended minutes.</p>	<p>Mr. Ida moved to approve the April 21, 2022 minutes, as circulated. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. <i>(Due to amendments the motion died with no vote)</i></p> <p>Mr. Ida moved to approve the amended April 21, 2022, minutes with a correction on page 6, “historic area disturbed and did not want the area repaved” to “stone columns and fence rails affected by any repaving activities”; page 7, “Open Space” to “the Kaua’i Historic Preservation Review Commission”; page 9, “was” to “were”; and page 9, “transit” to “transom”. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
E. General Business	Mr. Hull said there were no general business.	
F. Communications	Mr. Hull said there were no communications.	
G. Unfinished Business	<p>G.1. County of Kaua'i Department of Public Works Kōloa Bridge Rehabilitation Project Tax Map Key: (4) 2-8-006:025, (4) 2-8-006:999, (4) 2-8-007:016 and (4) 2-8-008:041 Kōloa, Hawai'i HRS 6E-8 Review for improvements to an existing bridge.</p> <p>Mr. Hull asked if anyone in person wanted to testify on this agenda item, hearing none, he asked Planner Myles Hironaka if there was anyone online through Zoom. Mr. Hironaka reported one attendee and asked if anyone online wanted to testify to raise their virtual hand; no one responded.</p> <p>Planner Marisa Valenciano shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commission's action for the project was to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Memorialize comments in a response letter of impact to historic property ○ Defer comments until more information becomes available • This project was approved by the commission in April with the condition that the rock columns and river rocks are not disturbed around the work site and that the Department of Public Works report back to the commission with alternatives to the guardrails and stanches. • The department recommended the commission prepare a letter in support of the project with the following comments; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Do not disturb the rock columns and river rocks along the work site ○ Consider alternatives to the guardrails and stanches <p>Chief Engineer Michael Mole presented a power point presentation along with Ikaika Kinkaid.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed guardrail: 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The guard rail would provide some degree of protection from cars falling off the steep bank into the river. ○ Evaluated the mauka guardrails and proposed the shortest guardrail which was 12-feet in length to minimize visual and installation impact. ○ ● Proposed Stanches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Help shift traffic to preserve integrity of one side of the bridge ○ Provided a safe walking pathway ○ Alternative would be a raised rubber curb bump like what was used on the Hanapēpē bridge <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chair Larson stated the stanches were used to keep traffic off one side of the bridge and asked how long they plan to use the stanches. Mr. Mole replied forever. ● Chair Larson asked if the plans included to strengthen that side of the bridge. Mr. Mole replied the spalls would be fixed. Mr. Kincaid stated that steel would be added to the cantilever section of the bridge where it was being overstressed by heavy trucks. Shifting traffic would preserve the integrity of the bridge. ● Chair Larson asked if there were plans to add an additional bridge. Mr. Mole replied there was no long-term plans to add an additional bridge. ● Chair Larson asked for the final solution for this bridge. Mr. Mole replied they had no plans to replace the bridge. ● Chair Larson asked if the Kōloa Town plans included an additional bridge or replacement bridge. Mr. Mole replied they had no plans to replace the bridge or add an additional bridge in the area except there was a long-term 10-year future project for a northern by-pass. ● Chair Larson asked once repairs were done what was the life of the bridge. Mr. Kinkaid replied at minimum 25-years. ● Chair Larson asked why the steel wasn't replaced in the area that caused the weak section of the bridge. Mr. Kincaid replied the plan to reinforce the weak section. Mr. Mole added the problem wasn't the missing steel but the bridges cantilever mauka 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>beams. Mr. Kincaid added that the concrete parapet was also on the cantilever section, the weak section of the bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Mole said they would be able to use the alternative rubber curbs in place of the plastic vertical stanches. • Chair Larson commented the long-term solution would be to escalate the preservation of the bridge and build an additional bridge. Mr. Mole replied the best long-term solution would be to inspect the bridge every other year and schedule frequent maintenance repairs. • Vice Chair Long asked what attributed to the deterioration and spalling of the bridge. Mr. Mole replied lack of county funding. • Vice Chair Long asked if the parapet would remain. Mr. Mole replied yes, it would remain in place. • Vice Chair Long asked if the additional structural work acted integrally with the existing structure or additional support to the existing structure. Mr. Kinkaid replied he couldn't remember and instead showed pictures of the area. • Chair Larson asked if they thought of adding a girder under the cantilever area. Mr. Kinkaid replied it was not needed and could cause an adverse effect. • Vice Chair Long asked if the rock walls were structural or left-over historic aesthetics. Mr. Mole replied they were left over historic artifacts in the area and not structural for the bridge. • Vice Chair Long added that there were several trees that grew around the end of the walls causing deterioration. Mr. Mole agreed but it was not on county property. <p>Vice Chair Long thanked Mr. Kinkaid.</p> <p>With no further questions to the applicant, Chair Larson asked for a motion. DCA Hall said the motion could be to accept and approve with the following comments; do not disturb river rocks or rock columns, use guardrails, use alternative stanches like the ones used for the Hanapēpē bridge and request that the county look for immediate long-term traffic solutions to extend the life of the bridge.</p>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to accept and approve the Kōloa Bridge Rehabilitation Project</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>Tax Map Key: (4) 2-8-006:025, (4) 2-8-006:999, (4) 2-8-007:016 and (4) 2-8-008:041, Kōloa, Hawai'i, HRS 6E-8 Review for improvements to an existing bridge with the following comments; do not disturb river rocks or rock columns, use guardrails, use alternative stanches similar to the ones used for the Hanapēpē bridge and request that the county look for immediate long-term traffic solutions to extend the life of the bridge. Mr. Ida seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
<p>H. New Business</p>	<p>H.1. EBI Consulting, Inc., (on behalf of AT&T Mobility, LLC) Proposed monopine and telecommunications facility West of 5-705 Kūhiō Highway, Hanalei Tax Map Key: (4) 5-8-010:011 Hā'ena, Hawai'i National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Department's response letter to EBI Consulting, Inc. dated June 24, 2022 b. Director's report pertaining to this matter. <p>Mr. Hull asked if anyone in person wanted to testify on this agenda item, hearing none, he asked if anyone online wanted to testify to raise their virtual hand; no one responded.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Planner Marisa Valenciano shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read portions of the Director’s Report dated July 21, 2022. • The commission’s action for the project was to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide comments in a Section 106 response letter ○ Defer comments until more information becomes available • The applicant did not provide areas of potential effect • The subject property was adjacent to a National Historic Register the Kaua‘i belt road north shore section. • The department recommended KHPRC make a motion to provide comments in a response letter identifying historic properties and proposed impact to historic properties. <p>Bryce Novak and an unidentified speaker attended by Zoom and shared a power point presentation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would have a standard equipment configuration and enhanced AT&T coverage. • Showed layout of site with tower placement <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vice Chair Long asked for information on the public’s response to the project. Mr. Novak replied community outreach and cultural impact assessment would happen prior to the planning commission. • Vice Chair Long appreciated the possible coverage to other cellphone carries and asked if the tower was 90 or 95 feet tall. Mr. Novak replied the top of the pine tree was 95 feet. • Chair Larson asked for the height of the Norfolk pine adjacent to the property. Mr. Novak replied the pine trees near the tower were about 50 feet high and adjacent pine trees were a lot taller. • Chair Larson asked for the height difference of the adjacent Norfolk pine to the tower. Mr. Novak replied he would send a surveyor out to measure but believed it was about 100 feet high. Chair Larson asked to bring that information back in a future presentation. • Chair Larson requested they maintain the historic belt road with ample foliage and 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>vegetation in front of the site to obstruct any visual sightline of the tower.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vice Chair Long if there were any additional landscaping to obscure the tower without hindering its effectiveness. Mr. Novak replied that planting additional pine trees could obstruct the signal. • Vice Chair Long asked if the plans included additional landscaping. Mr. Novak replied not at this time and the existing foliage was sufficient. Vice Chair Long added that it might be an opportunity to bring it up with the community. • Chair Larson asked if the chain link fence would be placed around the entire property. Mr. Novak replied it would be around AT&T's compound with privacy slats. Mr. Novak showed the area that would be fenced; it would not cover the entire property. • Mr. Ida asked if AT&T owned the property. Mr. Novak replied no, they had a lease with the property owner. • Mr. Ida asked if there were any structures on the property. Mr. Novak replied no. • Mr. Ida had major concerns for the project because it was in Hā'ena and he knew of burial sites and cultural materials within a thousand feet of the site. He said Hā'ena contained the earliest carbon dates in the state. • Vice Chair Long asked Mr. Ida if he wanted an archaeological survey. Mr. Ida suggested an archaeological surface survey with subsurface testing. Mr. Hull added that these comments could be taken in consideration as a recommended condition of approval because there were permits attached to this project. Mr. Ida replied that he would be satisfied with his suggestion; however, if any remnants were discovered it would dictate what would need to happen next. An unidentified speaker said the site would be monitored. • Ms. Summers stated that the SMA permit would require more conditions of approval. Mr. Hull said yes, there were several permits attached to this project that would be reviewed and approved by the planning commission. <p>Mr. Hull advised that the motion could include the section 106 and zoning permit. He said once planning department receives the zoning permit, they route it to the respective agencies and in a couple of months it could also be reviewed by KHPRC, unless this motion included the section 106 and zoning permit. KHPRC had an option to include both or just include the section 106.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Valenciano advised the motion include comments for section 106 and recommend conditions of approval for the zoning permit to the planning commission for their consideration.</p> <p>Mr. Long commented that the archaeological survey and subsurface testing should be completed prior to the section 106 community outreach so the public could review and comment. Mr. Hull said a public outreach and input was not required; the applicant decided to organize a community outreach on their own and the archaeological survey and subsurface testing was only a recommendation to the planning commission and not a condition of approval.</p>	<p>Mr. Ida moved concerning both section 106 review and review by the Planning Commission that minimally require archaeological surface survey with subsurface testing on the EBI Consulting, Inc., (on behalf of AT&T Mobility, LLC) Proposed monopine and telecommunications facility West of 5-705 Kūhiō Highway, Hanalei, Tax Map Key: (4) 5-8-010:01, Hā'ena, Hawai'i and any further archaeological work above and beyond that would be dictated by the planning of the initial survey. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion.</p> <p>Mr. Long recommend as part of the first motion by Mr. Ida, that archaeological survey and subsurface testing be done prior to the section 106 outreach to the community and additional landscape architecture plan that may or may not include endemic trees</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Hull said the motion covered both the section 106 and zoning permit and asked Vice Chair Long to explain the historic aspect of recommending a landscape architect plan. Vice Chair Long replied that many projects do not include endemic plants in the landscaping plans. Chair Larson added that landscaping was important to the historic belt road and should fit in with the existing landscape.</p> <p>With no further questions to the applicant, Chair Larson asked for a vote.</p> <p><i>Chair Larson called for a recess at 3:12 p.m.</i> <i>Chair Larson resumed the meeting at 3:18 p.m.</i></p>	<p>and/or other landscaping that match the existing adjacent landscaping. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried 6:0.</p>
	<p>H.2. Hawai'i Department of Transportation Highways Division-Kaua'i District Wailua River Bridge Permanent Repairs Tax Map Keys: (4) 3-9-002:021; (4) 3-9-002:030; (4) 3-9-002:999; (4) 3-9-004:006; (4) 3-9-006:012; (4) 3-9-006:029; (4) 3-9-006:999; (4) 4-1-004:001; (4) 4-1-004:005; (4) 4-1-004:006; (4) 4-1-004:007; (4) 4-1-004:008; (4) 4-1-004:020; (4) 4-1-004:999 Wailua, Hawai'i</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. State of Hawai'i Department of Transportation-Initiation of Section 106 consultation letter dated June 25, 2020 b. County of Kaua'i Planning Department Response letter dated July 23, 2020 c. State of Hawai'i Preservation Division Concurrence and Effect Determination letter dated November 12, 2020 d. Director's report pertaining to this matter. <p>Mr. Hull asked if anyone in person wanted to testify on this agenda item, hearing none, he asked if anyone online wanted to testify to raise their virtual hand; no one responded. Mr. Hironaka verified that no one online raised their virtual hand.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Planner Marisa Valenciano shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read portions of the Director’s Report dated July 21, 2022. • The commission’s action for the project was to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide comments in a section 106 response letter ○ Defer comments until more information becomes available • The Planning Department recommended KHPRC motion to provide a response letter with comments on the proposed impact to the 1919 Wailua River bridge remnant and input on the modifications to the undertakings that could minimize and mitigate the effect. <p>District Engineer Kaua‘i District Highways Division of the State of Hawai‘i Department of Transportation Lawrence Dill and SOH Department of Transportation Eric Fujikawa. Attending by Zoom were consultant Harry Kumoto, Historic Architect Guy Blanchard, and Trisha Watson;</p> <p>Mr. Dill reviewed the following with the commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two Wailua river bridges; the mauka bridge was the Wailua river bridge and the makai bridge was the Wailua plantation bridge. In between those two bridges stood another bridge and the remnant abutments remain from a demolition many years ago. • Completed section 106 with the Planning Department • Contractor will not be able to avoid impacting the remnant abutment on the north side of the Wailua river that existed between the two bridges. <p>Mr. Fujikawa shared a power point presentation with the commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substructure replacement of Wailua river bridge due to floods in March 2020 • Flood caused scour damages under the piers • Install concrete drilled shafts on either side of each of the seven piers and remove existing piers 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vice Chair Long asked to explain in kind replacement. Mr. Dill replied they would demolish the north side abutments and retaining wall and it would be rebuilt with in kind materials. • Vice Chair Long asked if they would reuse the materials to reconstruct the replacement items. Mr. Dill replied no. • Vice Chair Long asked about the rock area. Mr. Dill replied the rock area was replaced in 2020. • Vice Chair Long asked if heavy impact was considered in the design of the bridge. Mr. Dill replied yes, the intent was to make a more robust and sturdier bridge. • Vice Chair Long commented that he appreciated the Department of Transportation work on this project. • Chair Larson asked if they planned to demolish the entire retaining wall. Mr. Dill replied majority of the wall would be removed. • Chair Larson asked if replacement in kind meant the retaining wall and material. Mr. Dill replied both. • Chair Larson asked the reason for reconstructing the abutment. Mr. Dill replied to bring back the historic character of what was there before. • Chair Larson proposed they find someone to tell the history and story of the old Wailua bridge. Mr. Dill agreed and shared that as part of the mitigation a HAER (Historical American Engineering Record) report would be completed. • Ms. Watson asked Chair Larson if interpretive signage or documentation from the HAER report would suffice for the history and story of the bridge. Chair Larson replied yes and wasn't sure where it would be appropriate to keep that information available to the public. • Vice Chair Long asked if she wanted a plaque or permanent signage mounted on the bridge or bike path because the bridge had a pedestrian pathway. Chair Larson replied the pedestrian path was on the mauka bridge. Mr. Dill said he wouldn't encourage pedestrians to walk on the bridge to read a plaque given the heavy vehicular traffic. He said the 1919 abutment was in an area where you wouldn't be able to see it. Ms. Watson suggested they could work with the Kaua'i Historic Society to maintain it in 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>their resource library and public TV could record the history and preserve it on their website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Ida commented that the abutment on the Līhu‘e side was nothing to look at and most people would not be able to identify it and signage on the pedestrian bike path made more sense. • Mr. Guerber agreed that it would be better to preserve and document the history of the bridge online. • Vice Chair Long asked if they could architecturally enhance the columns instead of it being a smooth circular column. Mr. Blanchard (unsure if he spoke) replied that due to the constant debris a smooth circular column would work best and avoid debris from clinging to it; it was also easier to repair in the long run. • Chair Larson proposed to memorialize comments about the bridge and present a repaired bridge that was worthy of the history and had beautiful aesthetics. <p>With no further questions to the applicant, Chair Larson asked for a motion. DCA Hall summarized their comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a resource to tell the story of the bridge as mitigation and possibly use Kaua‘i Historic Society for the interpretive signage, brochure, or recorded story on website or plaque with photos and agency memorialize commissions comments when replacing bridge and take into consideration the commissions concern on aesthetics. 	<p>Vice Chair Long moved accept and approve the Hawai‘i Department of Transportation Highways Division-Kaua‘i District Wailua River Bridge Permanent Repairs, Tax Map Keys: (4) 3-9-002:021; (4) 3-9-002:030; (4) 3-9-002:999; (4) 3-9-004:006; (4) 3-9-006:012; (4) 3-9-006:029; (4) 3-9-006:999; (4) 4-1-004:001; (4) 4-1-004:005; (4) 4-1-004:006; (4) 4-1-004:007; (4) 4-1-</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>004:008; (4) 4-1-004:020; (4) 4-1-004:999, Wailua, Hawai'i project as presented with inclusion of comments summarized by Architect Guy Blanchard. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. <i>(Due to amendments the motion died with no vote)</i></p> <p>Vice Chair Long moved to support the project Hawai'i Department of Transportation Highways Division-Kaua'i District Wailua River Bridge Permanent Repairs, Tax Map Keys: (4) 3-9-002:021; (4) 3-9-002:030; (4) 3-9-002:999; (4) 3-9-004:006; (4) 3-9-006:012; (4) 3-9-006:029; (4) 3-9-006:999; (4) 4-1-004:001; (4) 4-1-004:005; (4) 4-1-004:006; (4) 4-1-004:007; (4) 4-1-004:008; (4) 4-1-004:020; (4) 4-1-004:999, Wailua, Hawai'i as presented with the following comments; the agency create a resource to tell the story of bridge as mitigation possibly with the Kaua'i Historic Society using interpretive signage, brochure, or recorded</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>story on website or plaque with photos and agency memorialize commissions comments when replacing the bridge and take into consideration the commissions concerns on aesthetics. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
	<p>H.3. Commissioner Training Basic Definitions and Terms for Archeological Studies, Methods, and Techniques</p> <p>Mr. Hull stated no one was present in person and asked if anyone online wanted to testify to raise their virtual hand; no one responded. Mr. Hironaka confirmed there was no one online.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano said this was a pilot training and she asked Commissioner Ida to share his expertise on archaeological methods and terminology. She reached out to Maui's Cultural Resource Planning Commission on how they handled training and Chair Larson expressed interest in including more training.</p> <p>Chair Larson thanked Mr. Ida. She said this was an important initiative and they would develop training modules online for new commissioners or anyone to access.</p> <p>Commissioner Ida shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Started archaeology work in 1979 and had a degree in Hawaiian and Pacific history. • 1979 worked for the first private consulting archaeological company in the state for three years, left and returned to archaeological work in 1992. He retired seven years ago. • The process starts when a project triggers SHPD (State Historic Preservation Division) involvement. • A surface survey involved a 100% visual coverage inspection of the site. Archaeologist are spread apart on the site and inspect the ground looking for bones or clues that something 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>was there before.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A subsurface testing involved digging or trenching soil at the site using a shovel, backhoe, or excavator. They normally know ahead of time the history of the property and location of historic areas and cultural significance. They record the different soil layers and document clues of fire pits, walls of what was there in the past and any other artifacts. • The next step would determine if there were enough historic and cultural remains for an archaeologist to remain on site during construction. • Mr. Guerber asked if they suspect something significant in the area how far down do they dig. Mr. Ida replied not very deep. He said human remains or cultural remains were normally buried three to four feet deep. • The archaeologist then decides if a project required onsite monitoring or data recovery. • If the project site was planned to be destroyed during construction, they complete a data recovery to preserve the information. They plan which areas on the site to investigate. They plan which areas would require digging and all soil would be screened for material and documented. • Vice Chair Long asked for the difference between archaeological survey and study. Mr. Ida replied a survey was what was just mentioned above, and a study was a general term that archaeologist do not use. • Mr. Guerber stated the commission should not use archaeological study because it could mean just researching books. Mr. Ida replied yes, archaeologist use specific terminology. • Chair Larson asked why they would ask for a surface survey or subsurface testing instead of an onsite archaeologist to monitor. Mr. Ida replied because they would not be able to see what was buried under the ground. Subsurface testing provided clues of what was there or not there. He said monitoring a site was limited and witnessed five burials ruined when a backhoe or excavator penetrated the soil on its first dig. • Mr. Hull commented if an archaeological surface survey was the same or part of a subsurface testing. Mr. Ida replied archaeological surface survey inspected what was on the surface of the site. An archaeological surface survey with subsurface testing was a layered stage that fueled the next process. • Mr. Hull asked if after a surface survey was completed could an archaeologist recommend subsurface testing based on their findings and after that could it lead to something else. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Ida replied (<i>inaudible</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair Larson asked if any building processes included archaeological monitoring. Mr. Hull replied that the applicant had to comply with permit requirements there was no county automatic requirement for archaeological monitoring unless imposed by SHPD. • Ms. Remoaldo asked how they could attach value to encourage an applicant to go through an archaeological finding. (<i>there was a short inaudible discussion</i>) • Mr. Hull said they have two GIS (Geographic Information System) mapping pros that was working on digitizing the planning process. • Mr. Ida said data recovery was used if an area was going to be demolished. They consider if an area on the site needed to be saved and preserved and if a buffer or signage used to preserve site. • Cultural impact assessment started a few years relatively new. Review archival materials and assess what cultural activity took place in that area, archival materials, interview families, review chants, legends, and stories. • Chair Larson asked why cultural impact assessments were under archaeology. Mr. Ida replied it was not, it was under SHPD. • Mr. Hull said the Hawai'i constitution protected the traditional cultural practices of native Hawaiians and archaeological sites to preserve traditions and practices. Responsibility of cultural impact planning department and planning commission. • Mr. Guerber asked what could be done and what was the liability if the commission required a subsurface survey. Mr. Hull said the commission would not need to worry because it will advise all actions, KHPRC gives recommendations. • Mr. Hull asked if the national trust for historic preservation criteria for nomination to the national register the same criteria that Mr. Ida mentioned earlier. Mr. Ida replied yes. • Ms. Remoaldo shared that historic properties were more than just architecture; it was view plains, flora, and fauna. <p>Ms. Valenciano thanked Mr. Ida for conducting today's lesson on archaeology 101.</p>	
<p>I. Executive Session</p>	<p>The Commission did not enter executive session.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
5. Announcements	Mr. Hull announced the following; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioners invited to a Hawai'i Congress of Planning Officials conference September 14-16, 2022, and to RSVP with Marissa . • Chair Larson suggested a site visit for Sueoka Store which would be a special meeting. • July 23, historic foundation workshop 9:30am to 11:30am on Zoom on how to research the history of a home 	
6. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics (August 18, 2022)	Next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, August 18, 2022	
7. Adjournment	With no further business to conduct, Chair Larson called for a motion to adjourn.	Mr. Guerber moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Ida seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0. Chair Larson adjourned the meeting at 4:59 p.m.

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.