

Approved as Amended

OPEN SESSION MEETING MINUTES

Board/Commission	Kaua`i Historic Preservation Review Commission	Meeting Date:	February 19, 2026
Location	Lihu`e Civic Center, Mo`ikeha Building, Meeting Room 2A/2B	Start of Meeting: 1:03 p.m.	End of Meeting: 2:32 p.m.
Present	Vice Chair Aubrey Summers. Commissioners: Chucky Boy Chock, Kathleen Kikuchi-Samonte, Gerald Ida, Sandi Quinsaas, Susan Remoaldo, Julie Souza, and Ex-Officio Hi`ilei Hamberg. Deputy County Attorney Charles Foster. Planning Department Staff: Deputy Director Jodi A. Higuchi Sayegusa, Planner Marisa Valenciano, and Secretary Duke Nakamatsu. Boards and Commissions Staff: Support Clerk Celine De Leon and Administrator Ellen Ching.		
Excused	Chair Carolyn Summers-Larson		
Absent			



SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
A. Call to Order	Vice Chair Summers called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.	
B. Roll Call	Deputy Planning Director Jodi A. Higuchi Sayegusa verified attendance by roll call: Commissioner Chock replied here. Commissioner Kikuchi-Samonte replied here. Ex-Officio Hamberg replied here. Commissioner Ida replied here. Commissioner Quinsaas replied here. Commissioner Remoaldo replied here. Commissioner Souza replied here. Vice Chair Summers replied here.	A quorum was established with

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>C. Selection of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson</p>	<p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa opened the floor for Chair nominations.</p> <p>Vice Chair Summers nominated Mr. Gerald Ida. Mr. Chock nominated Ms. Aubrey Summers.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that the Commission could now consider the first nominee, Mr. Ida, for the position of Chair. She asked if there was any discussion and called for a motion and a second.</p> <p>Vice Chair Summers stated that because Mr. Ida was not fully willing to serve, she would be willing to do so. She added that she would support Mr. Ida being nominated for Vice Chair if he was willing.</p> <p><i>Vice Chair Summers immediately assumed Chair duties.</i></p> <p>Chair Summers was congratulated by the Commission and Planning Department Staff.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa opened the floor for Vice Chair nominations.</p> <p>Ms. Remoaldo nominated Mr. Gerald Ida.</p>	<p>seven (7) Commissioners present.</p> <p>Ms. Remoaldo moved to close Chair nominations. Ms. Quinsaot seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p>Ms. Remoaldo moved to elect Ms. Aubrey Summers to serve as Chair for calendar year 2026. Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p>Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte moved to close Vice Chair nominations. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>Mr. Ida immediately assumed Vice Chair duties.</i></p> <p>Vice Chair Ida was congratulated by the Commission and Planning Department Staff.</p>	<p>Ms. Remoaldo moved to elect Mr. Gerald Ida to serve as Vice Chair for calendar year 2026. Ms. Quinsaat seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p>
<p>D. Approval of Agenda</p>		<p>Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte moved to approve the February 19, 2026, agenda. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p>
<p>E. Minutes of the Minute(s) of the KHPRC</p>	<p>1. December 25, 2025, Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Ms. Remoaldo requested that on page 2, in that last paragraph, fourth sentence, the phrase “state holders” may be a spelling error and should likely read “stake holders.” On page 9, in the first paragraph about halfway down on the right-hand side, the sentence reads “... historic properties with inadvertent findings were identified near the conducted...” and it appears the word “location” should replace “conducted.” On page 12, in the second-to-last paragraph, the sentence beginning “Mr. Takeda explained that once the project is fully completed and the equipment is removed, the only visible evidence on the land portion...” appears to be incomplete. On page 21, in the last paragraph, the phrase “...shown are archaeological design...” likely should read “architectural design.” Other than minor gender and spelling corrections, no additional amendments were noted.</p>	<p>Ms. Remoaldo moved to approve the December 25, 2025, Meeting Minutes with the stated amendments. Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p>
<p>F. General Business</p>	<p>1. <u>State of Hawai`i Department of Hawaiian Home Lands</u> <u>Anahola Kuleana Homestead Settlement</u> <u>TMK: (4) 4-7-002:004 (por.); (4) 4-8-002-001 (por.); (4) 4-8-003-006 (por.)</u></p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><u>Anahola, Kaua`i</u> <u>National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties</u></p> <p><i>There was no one in the public to testify on this agenda item.</i></p> <p>Ms. Valenciano explained that the project before the Commission is a Section 106 review. The action required by the KHPRC is to provide comments in a Section 106 response regarding the project’s potential effects on historic properties. The Commission may provide comments in a response letter, defer comments until more information becomes available, or acknowledge receipt of the consultation request under Section 106 and Chapter 6E. She noted that the project applicant is the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL), which operated under the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The Section 106 review is triggered by federal funding, specifically NAGPRA funds. The proposed project involves the development of a residential subdivision consisting of approximately 115 homestead lots on former vacant agricultural lands in Anahola. Ms. Valenciano explained that the Section 106 review for this project is primarily limited to site preparation activities, including infrastructure work, rather than the construction of the homes themselves. She added that some of the funding will also support homeowner assistance programs, such as mortgage and rent stabilization assistance. Regarding cultural and historic resource identification, Ms. Valenciano summarized the work completed by the consultants. An archaeological reconnaissance survey previously identified approximately eight historic properties within the area. Additional reconnaissance-level work was conducted to evaluate the significance of architectural features. Of the eight identified sites, two were determined to be potentially eligible for listing on the historic register. Of these, one site is proposed to be preserved, while the other will be avoided. Ms. Valenciano concluded by stating</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>that the Planning Department recommends the Commission to make a motion to provide comments in a response letter addressing the area of potential effect, the identification of historic properties, and the project's potential effects on those historic properties.</p> <p><i>The Commission heard from Jeff Seastrom, senior planner on behalf of DHHL.</i></p> <p>Mr. Seastrom explained that reducing the homestead waitlist is a statewide issue and that the DHHL has been exploring new initiatives to address it. One of these initiatives is the Kuleana Homestead Lot program. Under this approach, applicants may receive a lot more quickly than through the traditional homestead process, but the lots are provided "as-is." Unlike traditional homesteads, which typically include road access and utilities, Kuleana Homestead Lots requires recipients to develop the land themselves. The program is intended for individuals interested in subsistence agriculture or small-scale farming. He noted that former agricultural lands, such as those in Anahola, are well suited for this type of program. Historically, Anahola supported subsistence agriculture prior to Western contact, though many traditional practices were lost with the rise of plantation agriculture. DHHL currently manages over 4,000 acres of land in the area, the largest land inventory in Kaua'i. Much of this land had previously been leased to plantations, but after the closure of the Lihu'e Plantation in 1997, the lands were returned to DHHL. The department is now seeking ways to utilize these lands to address the homestead waitlist while supporting agricultural use. Mr. Seastrom described the project area as being located between Anahola and Kapa'a and surrounded by lands managed by the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR), including conservation lands. Existing conditions consist of former agricultural lands that are now heavily overgrown with dense vegetation. He explained that the project will be implemented in two phases. The initial phase, which is currently being prepared for bid, focuses on road construction</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>and infrastructure development by the DHHL Land Division. The development of the individual homestead lots will occur in a later phase. Due to the structure of NEPA and NAHA funding, the project is undergoing a tiered review process. The current review represents the first tier, focusing primarily on the infrastructure work. However, the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) considers the infrastructure and future lot development to be part of the same overall undertaking, so the Section 106 review addresses the broader project area. He noted that additional archaeological work will occur as the lots are further defined. While a conceptual plan for the subdivision was included in the presentation packet, it remains preliminary. Because the area is heavily vegetated and was previously used for agriculture, it is possible that additional historic features may be identified during later studies. DHHL and SHPD acknowledge this possibility and anticipate that further Archaeological Inventory Surveys (AIS) may be conducted on a lot-by-lot or phased basis. He summarized the previous archaeological work conducted for the environmental assessment. A reconnaissance survey completed in 2018 identified eight historic sites, primarily associated with plantation-era agriculture. These included reservoirs, railroad features, retaining structures, and other agricultural infrastructure, along with a historic artifact. More recently, SHPD requested that these sites also be evaluated from a historic architectural perspective. Architectural historians revisited the sites originally identified in the earlier survey and generally corroborated the earlier findings, although the sites have become more overgrown since the original 2017-2018 studies. Through this architectural evaluation and for purposes of the Section 106 review, two sites were determined to retain sufficient integrity to be considered eligible for historic listing: Site 1, a portion of the plantation ditch system, and Site 5, Reservoir 3. Mr. Seastrom explained that the ditch system extends for many miles across the former plantation landscape and that only certain portions remain visible or intact. The most intact features of the ditch system will be preserved in place, while less intact or fragmentary portions that are difficult to identify will not be preserved. Because the ditch system runs throughout the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>conceptual development area and is no longer active, preserving isolated fragments was determined to provide limited benefit. For mitigation, Site 5, the reservoir, will be avoided entirely. Another reservoir identified during earlier studies lies outside the project area. The primary mitigation for Site 1 will involve preserving the intact ditch system features in place. Other architectural recordation, which includes detailed photography, architectural documentation, and preparation of a Historic American Engineering Record-style report. He stated that the report outlining these findings and recommendations has been submitted to SHPD for review. The next anticipated step is the preparation of a preservation plan, which consultants Nohopapa and Fung are prepared to develop. He concluded by outlining the project timeline. The current meeting forms part of the Section 106 consultation process. DHHL has reached out to Native Hawaiian organizations, stakeholders, and the County to gather comments. Feedback from this meeting will be included in the Section 106 record and incorporated into the environmental review required for NAHA funding. DHHL aims to complete the consultation process by the end of the month, submit the funding application in March, and begin initial infrastructure work by late March or April. Development of the homestead lots is anticipated to occur from 2026 through 2030, depending on funding the project availability.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ida asked whether an archaeologist had conducted any surveys on the property, noting that the report states a historic architect completed the reconnaissance-level survey.</p> <p>Mr. Seastrom clarified that an archaeological reconnaissance survey was conducted in 2018 as part of the environmental assessment. He explained that after the report was submitted, SHPD agreed with the findings but requested that a historic architect also evaluate the sites. As a result, both Nohopapa Archaeology and Fung, a historic architecture firm, conducted reviews of the property.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Vice Chair Ida asked whether the sites were identified during the archaeological reconnaissance survey.</p> <p>Mr. Seastrom confirmed that the sites were initially identified during the archaeological reconnaissance survey. He explained that the findings differ from the reconnaissance-level architectural lens for Section 106 and Chapter 6E review, which affects how integrity and significance are determined. He noted that Site 1 was in the best condition and suitable for preservation. Mr. Seastrom added that the current infrastructure work will occur along existing earth roads where no sites were identified; however, any location where the work crosses the ditch system will be documented. He also explained that due to dense vegetation, only accessible areas have been surveyed so far. As vegetation is cleared during infrastructure work or future lot development, additional sites may be identified and evaluated by archaeologists, historic architects, or both, and could be preserved if warranted.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa noted that, as summarized in Marisa's report, the Commission has several options: to provide comments on the project, defer comments until more information becomes available, or simply receive the request for consultation.</p> <p>Chair Summers asked whether the Commission could accept the consultation now and provide comments later if additional input arises.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa confirmed that the Commission could place the item on the agenda to decide</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa confirmed that the Commission could place the item on the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>agenda to decide on comments, but doing so would not prevent members from submitting additional comments later during the comment period.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano clarified that if the Commission chooses to delay providing comments, there is a risk of missing the strict 30-day Section 106 timeline. While comments can sometimes be submitted past the 30 days, she noted it would be preferable to provide any comments now so they can be included in the record within the required timeline.</p> <p>Ms. Remoaldo stated that she felt uncomfortable responding to the project when the documentation includes terms such as “presumably” and references to additional studies in the future, noting that it is difficult to provide comments without having all the information available.</p> <p>Ms. Souza asked why the property is not cleared before being made available to beneficiaries and questioned why they would need to clear the heavy vegetation themselves to use the land.</p> <p>Mr. Seastrom responded that, as a consultant for DHHL, he does not determine which lands are selected for projects. He noted that many lands in DHHL’s inventory statewide are not ideal for development, as they were turned over from previous uses. He explained that DHHL is pursuing multiple housing initiatives and that this project represents one option among several being considered on Kaua`i. He stated that DHHL leadership is seeking ways to move as many homestead opportunities forward as possible to reduce the waitlist. Through island plans and beneficiary surveys, DHHL has identified a group of applicants interested in subsistence agriculture rather than traditional turnkey homes. The Kuleana Homestead Lot approach is intended to provide that option and allow some applicants to receive land sooner rather than waiting for a fully developed homestead. Mr. Seastrom acknowledged the concern</p>	<p>Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte moved to accept/receive the request. Ms. Quinsaas seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>that beneficiaries may face additional challenges with undeveloped lands but explained that the program is meant to offer flexibility for those willing to take on that responsibility. He added that the consultants are working to minimize obstacles where possible and that the program may also provide opportunities for agricultural and economic activity that are not typically available with standard homestead lots.</p> <p>Ms. Souza questioned why nearby solar developments appear to occupy the more suitable portions of the property while homestead beneficiaries would need to clear heavily overgrown land before being able to build, noting that many applicants have already waited a long time for homestead opportunities.</p> <p>With no further discussion, the Commission thanked Mr. Seastrom and moved on to further business.</p>	
G. Communications	There were no Communications.	
H. Unfinished Business	There was no Unfinished Business.	
I. New Business	<p>1. <u>Talk Story Bookstore – Kaumakani Village</u> <u>Proposed storefront to an existing commercial building</u> <u>Property Address: 1-2500 Kaumuali`i Highway, Kaumakani</u> <u>TMK: (4) 1-7-006:001</u> <u>Kaumakani Village Plantation Camp</u> <u>Kaumakani, Kaua`i</u></p> <p><i>There was no one in the public to testify on this agenda item</i></p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Valenciano began by correcting her director’s report, clarifying that the railing mentioned is not existing but a proposed new wooden railing. She noted that the department distributed two handouts: a blue excerpt from the Plantation Camp Form-Based Code provided by the applicant and a photo handout showing the existing building and current shop signs as visual references only. She explained that the project is a Class I Zoning Permit for Talk Story Bookstore, which proposes constructing a western-style storefront facade in front of the existing commercial building in Kaumakani Plantation Camp. The facade would be a freestanding steel structure about 16 feet tall, with a wood veneer and corrugated metal roof overhang. It would sit approximately five feet in front of the building, attached to a new railing but not touching the historic structure, and would span about 26 feet wide. Ms. Valenciano provided background that the building previously served as the camp social hall and later housed the credit union and other businesses. While not currently listed on the historic register, the camp buildings are over 50 years old and on the county inventory list. A 2021 Fung Assessment determined that Kaumakani Camp may be eligible for historic district listing under Criteria A and C and retains high historic integrity. The bookstore building was identified as a contributing structure in good condition. In its evaluation, the department noted the property currently has two business signs, one attached to the building and one freestanding. These signs are considered compatible in size and character and do not obscure the historic building. The proposed storefront may require removal of the existing signs. The department also noted that the western-style false front contrasts with the plantation camp architectural style and questioned whether its size, scale, and massing may detract from the historic character. However, because the structure is freestanding, it would not damage the historic building and could be removed in the future. Ms. Valenciano added that the project generally meets the Plantation Camp Form-Based Code, though the applicant may need to review materials to comply with Wildfire Urban Interface (WUI)</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>regulations requiring non-combustible materials. She concluded that the department recommends the applicant consider alternatives, such as a highway sign that does not obscure the building, or if proceeding with the facade, reduce its size and massing and ensure it is installed in a reversible manner.</p> <p><i>The Commission heard from Mr. Ed Justus, owner of Talk Story Bookstore.</i></p> <p>Mr. Justus explained that Talk Story Bookstore began in Hanapēpē in 2004 and operated there for nearly 20 years before relocating to Kaumakani in May of last year after their insurance company would no longer cover their previous building, which must now be demolished and rebuilt. He says they are grateful for the opportunity to move into the historic building in Kaumakani, formerly the Gay and Robinson pool hall, which has also served as a church, credit union, and community display space. He stated that the bookstore wanted to honor the building's history and consulted Gay and Robinson before proposing the western-style facade. The facade is designed as a freestanding steel with fencing connecting it to the building so it can be removed in the future without damaging the historic structure. Mr. Justus also noted that he discussed the concept with the Planning Director Ka'aina Hull, who indicated that a western-style facade is consistent with the area's Form-Based Code. The proposal was then developed with Island Architects and submitted with the property owner's permission. He referenced materials in his packet, including photos of the building, architectural drawings, Form-Based Code excerpts, examples of similar facades in Hanapēpē and Waimea, and a letter of support from Gay and Robinson.</p> <p>Ms. Remoaldo asked how high the roof or ridgeline of the existing building is.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano responded that the plans included in the agenda packet show the building wall at 8 feet on sheet A2, but the roof or ridgeline height isn't indicated, so</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>it's difficult to determine the exact height.</p> <p>Chair Summers asked if the plans are drawn to scale, noting that if they are, measuring against other elements on the same sheet suggests the roof or ridgeline is approximately 14 feet high.</p> <p>Mr. Justus responded that they estimate the roof or ridgeline height to be between 14 and 16 feet, roughly in line with Chair Summers' suggestion.</p> <p>Ms. Remoaldo asked about the height of the proposed structure.</p> <p>Mr. Justus responded that the proposed facade is 18 feet tall from the ground to the top.</p> <p>Chair Summers asked whether Wall Section 1 on sheet A02, which shows the side portion, is 16 feet tall.</p> <p>Ms. Remoaldo offered comments, noting that while Talk Story wants to stand out, it's also important to fit within the community and honor the transition from their previous location. She stated that the proposed facade feels overwhelming, like a "time tunnel" or portal, rather than a subtle threshold into the new space. She observed that the false front is purely visual and does not address weather concerns, since it's separate from the original building. She suggested a smaller sign, roughly the width of the doors, about 8 feet, which would maintain the intended visual character without overpowering the building.</p> <p>Chair Summers asked if there were any drawings that show the proposed facade positioned in front of the existing building.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Justus asked for clarification, wondering if Chair Summers is referring to something other than the architectural drawings.</p> <p>Chair Summers clarified that in the current materials, the facade and the existing building are shown separately, so the existing building isn't visible behind the proposed facade and suggested that showing them together would help the commissioners better understand the proposal.</p> <p>Mr. Justus responded that he does have a combined drawing, but noted it is a rough, cut-and-paste version that isn't to scale. He explained that the version shown is about 26-30 feet wide, which is wider than the actual proposed facade. The permit request is for a 24-26 foot wide facade, so the drawing provides only a rough idea of how it would appear in front of the building.</p> <p>Chair Summers noted that in the submitted drawing, the facade appears much shorter than shown in the architectural plans, likely because the actual height of the existing building's ridge isn't indicated.</p> <p>Mr. Justus apologized and explained that the drawing is a rough, not-to-scale concept. He noted that the interior ceiling in the middle of the store is about 12 feet high, so accounting for the roof layers, he estimated the top of the existing building approximately 14 feet high.</p> <p>Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte said she appreciated the idea of using the Hanapēpē store facade to show continuity, but emphasized that when adding to a historic building, the new element should blend in without detracting from the original, while still being</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>recognizable as separate and new. She noted that the proposed facade feels very much like Hanapēpē and not entirely like Kaumakani, which has its own character. She liked the red color as it complements the area across the street but feels the facade as proposed is overwhelming. She suggested a design that flows more naturally with the building and surroundings, standing out, but in a subtler, more fitting way.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano echoed Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte’s comments, noting that the guidance from Preservation Brief 14 on exterior additions is subjective and can be tricky. She explained that additions should be distinguishable yet familiar, like telling an older sister from a younger sister, they look different but share characteristics. The challenge is achieving that balance architecturally: blending too much can feel inauthentic, while standing out too much can be overwhelming. She emphasized that this is the core discussion today, how to add new elements to an old building in a way that is respectful but clearly different, with details like materials and design to be further refined.</p> <p>Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte expressed concern about the proposed facade being approximately 2 feet higher than the existing roof, noting that with recent winds and weather, that height could be potentially hazardous.</p> <p>Mr. Justus responded that wind concerns were discussed with the architect, Mr. John Underwood. He explained that the facade framing is steel, with steel posts and beams designed to withstand up to 180 mph winds. He noted that while the structure is engineered for safety, they are flexible on the proportions and are willing to adjust the design to find a comfortable middle ground that works for everyone.</p> <p>Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte said her main concern is that while she appreciates the idea of bringing the Hanapēpē facade over, it shouldn’t stand out so much. She emphasized</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>that the design needs to blend in with the community, since the bookstore is there to be part of the community.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa noted that while many opinions and suggestions have been shared, the Commission will eventually need a motion and a second. She reminded the Commission that, as outlined in Ms. Valenciano's director's report, the Commission has several possible actions for providing recommendations.</p> <p><i>Commissioner Souza left the meeting at 2:20 p.m.</i></p> <p>Vice Chair Ida asked whether the primary purpose of the proposed facade is to attract attention from the highway.</p> <p>Mr. Justus confirmed that attracting attention from the highway is one of several purposes. He explained that the facade is meant to provide continuity from their Hanapēpē location to Kaumakani, add character to the building, which sits next to a similar structure, and help draw attention to Kaumakani as a whole. He emphasized that the design follows the western-style face guidance in the Form-Based Code, aiming to catch the eye subtly without being flashy, enhancing the overall area rather than focusing solely on the bookstore.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ida shared that when approaching from the highway, he expects to see the existing smooth, historic-looking building. He suggested that the bookstore might be better served with a highway sign rather than a tall facade, since the building is set back from the road. He clarified that this is just his opinion, noting that a sign on the highway could be more attention-grabbing without altering the character of the building.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Justus explained that they had originally planned to install a ground sign on the highway, but Gay and Robinson requested that it be placed closer to the building instead, which is why the facade is positioned where it is now. He also clarified that if the project proceeds, the small marquee sign above the door would be removed, and the existing ground sign would be relocated to the highway, pending permit approval.</p> <p>Mr. Chock asked about the neighbors' perspective, inquiring whether they agree with the proposed facade and how they feel about the new look.</p> <p>Mr. Justus responded that he has not spoken to neighbors directly about the facade. He noted that they have seen posters on the doors asking for support to help offset permitting and construction costs, so they are aware of the project, but he hasn't discussed the design or appearance with them in detail.</p> <p>Mr. Chock said the facade feels like introducing a new look to Kaumakani's charm. He isn't voting yet but understands the earlier points and likes the signage, recognizing the bookstore's intent.</p> <p>Ms. Quinsaas expressed agreement with Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte, stating that while it's positive that the bookstore is developing the area, the design should transition as smoothly as possible to avoid feeling standoffish.</p>	<p>Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte moved that the applicant consider alternatives to the storefront that does not detract from surrounding buildings. Mr. Chock seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
<p>J. Executive Session</p>	<p>There was no Executive Session held.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
K. Announcements	Ms. Valenciano shared that she circulated an email regarding Historic Hawai'i's recent webinars, including a series on parks and a training last month on Section 106 and Chapter 6E. She noted this is especially useful for newer commissioners as a refresher, with sessions lasting about an hour to an hour and a half. She also mentioned that it is legislative season, and the department is monitoring several bills related to historic properties among other topics. The department is in the process of reviewing these bills and tracking which will advance. Lastly, she noted that Ms. Quinsaats provided a stack of reference materials covering Section 106, Chapter 6E, and NAGPRA, in response to questions raised at the previous meeting.	
L. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics	Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that March 19, 2026, is the next date for a scheduled meeting.	
M. Adjournment		Ms. Quinsaats moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0. Chair Summers adjourned the meeting at 2:32 p.m.

Submitted by: Celine De Leon
 Celine De Leon , Staff Support Clerk

Reviewed and Approved by: _____
 Aubrey Summers, Chair

- () Approved as circulated on
- () Approved as amended. See minutes of _____ meeting.