

COUNTY OF KAUA'I  
Minutes of Meeting  
OPEN SESSION

Board/Commission:		<b>Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission</b>	Meeting Date	<b>February 18, 2021</b>
Location	Teleconference by Microsoft Teams		Start of Meeting: 2:22 p.m.	End of Meeting: 7:35 p.m.
Present	Chair Pro Tem Gerald Ida. Commissioners: James Guerber, Carolyn Larson, Stephen Long, Susan Remoaldo and Aubrey Summers. Deputy County Attorney Laura Barzilai. Planning Department Staff: Deputy Planning Director Jodi Higuchi-Sayegusa, Planner Myles Hironaka, Historic Planner Alex Wong, Commission Specialist Shanlee Jimenez and Planner Marisa Valenciano. Office of Boards and Commissions: Administrator Ellen Ching and Commission Support Clerk Sandra Muragin.			
Excused				
Absent				
SUBJECT	DISCUSSION			ACTION
	The Oath of Office was administered on February 12, 2021, by Administrative Assistant to the County Clerk Eddie Topenio to at-large mayoral appointee Gerald K. Ida, serving a 2nd term ending 12/31/23, architecture council appointee Aubrey Summers, serving a 2nd term ending 12/31/23 and Hawaiian culture mayoral appointee Susan C. Remoaldo, serving a 1st term ending 12/31/23.			
<b>A. Call To Order</b>	Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa notified the commission that Victoria Wichman termed out 12/31/2020. Vice Chair Ida called the meeting to order at 2:22 p.m.			
<b>B. Roll Call</b>	Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa verified attendance by roll call and requested a verbal response; Mr. Guerber replied here. Ms. Larson replied present. Mr. Long replied present. Ms. Summers replied present. Ms. Remoaldo replied present. Vice Chair Ida replied present.			Quorum was established with six commissioners present.
<b>C. Selection of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson</b>	Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa opened the floor for nominations for Chair. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Larson nominated Gerald Ida.</li> </ul>			Ms. Summers moved to close nominations for Chair and appoint Gerald Ida to serve as Chair for calendar year 2021. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Vice Chair Ida assumed the new position as Chair and opened the floor for nominations for Vice Chair.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Guerber nominated Susan Remoaldo.</li> </ul> <p>Commissioner Remoaldo assumed the new position as Vice Chair.</p>	<p>Vice Chair Ida moved to nominate himself to serve as Chair for calendar year 2021. There was no second. Motion carried 6:0.</p> <p>Ms. Larson moved to close nominations and appoint Susan Remoaldo to serve as Vice Chair for calendar year 2021. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried: 5-Ayes and 1-Nay (Ms. Remoaldo)</p>
<b>D. Approval of the Agenda</b>		<p>Mr. Guerber moved to approve the agenda, as circulated. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
<b>E. Approval of the February 20, 2020 Minutes</b>	<p><u>E. Meeting minutes of February 20, 2020.</u></p> <p>Vice Chair Remoaldo requested to abstain from voting since she was not present at the meeting.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to approve the February 20, 2020, minutes as circulated. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried: 5-Ayes, 0-Nays and 1-Abstained (Ms. Remoaldo).</p>
<b>F. General Business Matters</b>	<p>There were no items for the record.</p>	
<b>G. Communications</b>	<p>Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa noted he meeting packets was posted on February 16, 2021 and another testimony was transmitted this morning. Further testimonies should be transmitted to the clerk's office prior to 24-hours of the meeting.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>H. Unfinished Business</b>	There were no unfinished business.	
	Chair Ida asked if anyone from the public wanted to testify now. Hearing none Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa moved on to the next agenda item	
<b>I. New Business Chapter 343 &amp; Section 106 Projects:</b>	<p><b><u>I.1. Hawai'i Department of Transportation Highways Division – Kaua'i District Kūhiō Highway Traffic Signal Improvements</u></b>          Vicinity of Hanalei Bridge          Project No. 560A-01-20          Tax Map Key: (4) 5-4-04          Chapter 343, Hawai'i Revised Statutes Consultation</p> <p>Hawai'i Department of Transportation Highway Division, Kaua'i District Engineer Larry Dill presented the project to the commission and with him were Department of Transportation (DOT) Eric Fujikawa, Austin Tsutsumi &amp; Associates consultant Kimo Aiu and Mason's Architects consultant Barbara Shideler.</p> <p>Mr. Dill shared a power point presentation and proposed the installation of traffic signal lights at the one lane Hanalei Bridge to address vehicular congestion in the area;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State funded project.</li> <li>• In April 2018 repair work due to the floods was being done on Kūhiō Highway Route 560. The Federal aid project had the national historic preservation act consultation section 106 that resulted with a memorandum of agreements with Federal highways, DOT, State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD), the Advisory Counsel of Historic Preservation, Hanalei Roads Committee and they agreed that one of the mitigating measures for the impacts to the road was to install a traffic signal system at the Hanalei Bridge.</li> <li>• The prime reason was to address congestion in the Hanalei Bridge location.</li> <li>• The project work would be on Kūhiō Highway Route 560 in the vicinity of Hanalei Bridge which encompasses 1.12 to 1.27, less than two tenths of a mile.</li> <li>• In the event of an emergency the traffic signals could be remotely managed to allow the safe evacuation of vehicles crossing the bridge.</li> <li>• The traffic signals would use video detection to efficiently manage the flow of vehicles</li> </ul>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>crossing the bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Six traffic signals would be installed. Four on Kūhiō Highway Route 560 and two on Ohiki Road. Of the four on Kūhiō Highway two would be on the Princeville side and two on the Hanalei side of the bridge.</li> <li>• Traffic equipment; an electric service data meter pedestal and traffic controller cabinet would be installed on Kūhiō Highway Route 560 side of the road.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Dill proposed changes to the current road signs along Kūhiō Highway Route 560 in the Hanalei Bridge area;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install 21 new signs.</li> <li>• Remove 17 of the existing signs, which would result with an increase of four additional signs.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Dill proposed changes to Kūhiō Highway Route 560 leading to and leaving the Hanalei Bridge area;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Place thermoplastic rumble bar strips on the road.</li> <li>• Extend the existing guard rail to protect the traffic equipment and vehicles from veering off the road.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Dill presented two historic properties, Hanalei Bridge and Kūhiō Highway Route 560, within the project limits;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hanalei Bridge built in 1912.</li> <li>• Warren trusses added in 1967 and reconstructed in 2004.</li> <li>• Hanalei Bridge on the National Register of Historic Places in 1978 as a contributing structure within the Kaua'i belt road.</li> <li>• Kūhiō Highway Route 560 was on the Hawai'i Register of Historic Places in 2003 and then placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2004.</li> <li>• Construction of Kūhiō Highway Route 560 began in 1900 and completed in 1920 and is a 10 mile stretch from Princeville to Kē'ē Beach.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Dill presented the following;</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans and supporting documents submitted last month to SHPD (State Historic Preservation Division) for section 360 review and pending a response.</li> <li>• A propose in affect for Kūhiō Highway Route 560 was no historic properties affected. No permanent changes and it's reversible with minimal impact to the road. Work would not disqualify its position in the National Register of Historic Places. Not proposing a mitigation.</li> <li>• A propose in affect for Hanalei Bridge was an affect with proposed mitigation commitments.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Work would have the potential to affect a significant historic property, the bridge structure, through installation of a conduit that could be visibly seen.</li> <li>○ A conduit would be installed on the bridge and concealed with minimal visibility. The conduit is required for the traffic equipment that would be located on both sides of the bridge to communicate with one another.</li> <li>○ Mitigation proposed work conforms to the Secretary of Interior Standards for the treatment of historic properties and will have Secretary of Interior qualified professional to confirm proposed and installed work is in conformance with the standards and submit a memorandum with photographs upon completion of work to SHPD. The proposed conduit concealed and minimally visible from both sides of the bridge, hidden beneath the bridge. The proposed conduit, the supports and traffic equipment are reversible and painted to match the environment. Removal of these proposed features would not damage the integrity of the bridge.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Questions and Comments;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Long requested limiting the number of signs to less than 21. Mr. Dill replied MUTCD (Manual Uniform Transportation Control Devices) have certain requirements, but they would review it again to possibly eliminate some of the proposed signs.</li> <li>2. Mr. Long asked what the signs were mounted on. Mr. Dill replied two by two inch square galvanized tubes which were the standard with breakaway posts.</li> <li>3. Ms. Larson asked for the decision process for the proposed installation of traffic lights. Mr. Dill replied the conversation started prior to the April 2018 storms and floods. It became various informal discussions with the community and turned into a project that</li> </ol>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>was discussed with consulting parties through section 106 consultation and asked about improvements and then a memorandum of agreement.</p> <p>4. Ms. Larson asked if other alternatives were proposed or discussed instead of traffic signals. Mr. Dill replied they discussed with the consultants opportunities to reduce peak time traffic and traffic lights were the only solution to address the congestion.</p> <p>5. Ms. Larson asked if they discussed how to reduce and control traffic from the top of the hill. Mr. Dill replied that he had no control over volume of traffic and could not stop traffic.</p> <p>6. Ms. Larson asked if they discussed reducing congestion. Mr. Dill replied he could not reduce congestion at the bridge with equipment or improvements at Princeville.</p> <p>7. Ms. Larson asked if the addition of another bridge was considered. Mr. Dill replied no, it would deal with the congestion but would be a very expensive and an almost impossible option.</p> <p>Ms. Larson expressed the following concerns;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project seriously impacts both historic resources and alternative should be sought.</li> <li>• Add an additional bridge across the Hanalei River.</li> <li>• Monitor traffic from the top of the hill at Princeville.</li> <li>• Minimize road signs.</li> </ul> <p>Chair Ida opened the floor for discussions.</p> <p>8. Mr. Guerber expressed concern with the increase in road signs and use of rumble strips. He asked if those were absolutely necessary. Mr. Dill replied they follow MUTCD requirements and would take another look if there were flexibility in eliminating some of the 21 recommended signs.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved that the Hawai'i Department of Transportation Highways Division Larry Dill seek alternatives to the present scope of the project and include creating an additional route across the Hanalei River. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>9. Mr. Guerber inquired if construction of a new bridge would be funded by the county or state. Mr. Dill replied it would be federally funded and typically 80% of the project costs were covered.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa commented that an in-house transportation planner had been working on a north shore shuttle since the April 2018 storms and floods.</p> <p>10. Ms. Larson requested they construct a stone wall instead of metal guardrails.</p> <p>11. Ms. Summers asked if the project improvements were removable. Mr. Dill said the improvements could be removed with minimal impact to the area but clarified that it was a permanent solution.</p> <p>12. Mr. Long questioned the need for rumble strips and commented the requirements and recommendations. Mr. Dill said they could review it again but it was being proposed for safety purposes.</p> <p>13. Mr. Long reiterated Ms. Larson's request for a stone wall instead of metal guardrails. Mr. Dill replied that based on the close proximity to the travel way and metal guardrails were required.</p> <p>14. Mr. Long asked if the traffic lights could be moved further away from the bridge to preserve the visual aesthetics of the bridge. Mr. Dill replied that the lights were placed in that location to allow the driver clear visibility of oncoming traffic.</p> <p>15. Chair Ida requested archaeological monitoring present during all trenching of road beds or on the edge of the stream for installation of the signs and inquired about the conduit that would be installed across the bridge. Mr. Dill concurred on the archaeological monitoring and the conduit would be buried underground and attached to the underside of the bridge.</p> <p>Vice Chair Remoaldo stated reservations on voting for Ms. Larson's motion. She asked if the second bridge could be separated into another motion. Ms. Summers concurred with Vice Chair Remoaldo.</p> <p>Chair Ida called for a vote. Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa proceeded with a roll call vote and requested a verbal response:          Mr. Guerber replied yes.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Larson replied yes.            Mr. Long replied yes.            Ms. Summers replied no.            Vice Chair Remoaldo replied no.            Chair Ida replied yes.</p> <p>Deputy County Attorney Laura Barzilai stated that the motion was similar.</p>	<p>Motion failed 4:2</p> <p>Ms. Larson moved that the Hawai'i Department of Transportation Highways Division Larry Dill seek alternatives to the proposed project plan and it may include an additional route across the Hanalei River. (Motion died with no second</p> <p>Ms. Larson moved that Larry Dill of the Hawai'i Department of Transportation Highways Division – Kaua'i District Kūhiō Highway Traffic Signal Improvements, Vicinity of Hanalei Bridge, Project No. 560A-01-20, Tax Map Key: (4) 5-4-04, Chapter 343, Hawai'i Revised Statutes Consultation project seek alternatives to the proposed project plan. Vice Chair Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>With no second to the motion, Mr. Dill responded to Mr. Longs motion with the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would not be able to report on any analysis of a second crossing of Hanalei River.</li> <li>• There are only two remotely possible locations for the construction of a second crossing of Hanalei River; one would be to extend Weke Road and the other would be right next to the existing bridge.</li> <li>• The public would probably not want a bridge in the vicinity of black pot and the character of the existing bridge would be compromised with the addition of a bridge right next to it.</li> <li>• Upstream of Hanalei River is protected under the United States Fish and Wildlife Sanctuary.</li> <li>• Shuttle service would be a good alternative but that would be better addressed by others.</li> </ul>	<p>Mr. Long moved to accept the Hawai'i Department of Transportation Highways Division – Kaua'i District Kūhiō Highway Traffic Signal Improvements, Vicinity of Hanalei Bridge, Project No. 560A-01-20, Tax Map Key: (4) 5-4-04, Chapter 343, Hawai'i Revised Statutes Consultation report and defer a decision until Larry Dill researched which signs were required versus recommended; include archaeological monitoring in the construction process with a caveat that they review an alternative bridge over the Hanalei River and potential need for shuttle service to Hanalei similar to the Hā'ena shuttle.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>16. Chair Ida inquired if there was a project timeline. Mr. Dill replied they do not have a confirmed timeline because they are still going through environmental consultation; however, it could start as early as later this year.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked Mr. Long to restate the motion.</p>	<p>Mr. Long moved to accept the Hawai'i Department of Transportation Highways Division – Kaua'i District Kūhiō Highway Traffic Signal Improvements, Vicinity of Hanalei Bridge, Project No. 560A-01-20, Tax Map Key: (4) 5-4-04, Chapter 343, Hawai'i Revised Statutes Consultation report and defer a decision until Larry Dill provides the commission with additional information on three items;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Define requirements versus recommendations for the projects improvements to limit the physical impact.</li> <li>2. Reduce the number of proposed road signs.</li> <li>3. Archaeological monitoring during construction.</li> </ol> <p>Ms. Larson seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
	<p><b>I.2. County of Kaua'i Department of Public Works – Engineering Division Hanapēpē Bridge Rehabilitation Project</b>            Federal-Aid Project Number: BR-0545(1)</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Tax Map Key(s): (4) 1-9-007-013            (4) 1-9-011-012            (4) 1-9-011:999 (ROW)</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties.</p> <p>County of Kaua'i Chief Engineer of Public Works Michael Moule presented the project to the commission and with him were CONSOR Engineers, LLC consultant Ikaika Kincaid. He shared a power point presentation.</p> <p>Project Overview:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federally funded using Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds</li> <li>• Design and permitting consultants; CONSOR Engineers, LLC and WSP USA</li> <li>• Completed section 106 in 2012 and SHPD approved than retracted due to late public comments regarding the elevated pedestrian walkway which the previous project was supposed to remove and replace with a walkway at bridge deck level.</li> </ul> <p>History of Hanapēpē Bridge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 110 year old bridge that was built in 1911, could be the oldest bridge that the county owns.</li> <li>• Pedestrian walkway added in 1927.</li> </ul> <p>Project Objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repair spalls and deterioration.</li> <li>• Repair elevated pedestrian walkway.</li> <li>• Restore load capacity to 20 tons, currently at a 10 ton limit.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Repair Project Scope of Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repair bridge defects: spalls, cracks and paint to match existing color.</li> <li>• Install drainpipes to keep water away.</li> <li>• New structural improvements: remove existing asphalt roadway and replace with reinforced concrete with an AC overlay.</li> </ul>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restore elevated pedestrian walkway. Install precast deck plants and new railings that meet safety standards and resemble original design.</li> <li>• ADA compliant pedestrian sidewalk on the Makai side road.</li> <li>• Unplug existing drain holes in deck to allow water drainage.</li> <li>• Add reinforced concrete deck on top of existing deck and top with asphalt.</li> <li>• Repair railings on elevated pedestrian walkway; add three cable wires at bottom of railing, which was an original design and add a third post between the first and second to comply with safety standards.</li> <li>• Change the double brackets to the original design of single brackets under the elevated pedestrian walkway.</li> </ul> <p>Best Management Practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction debris would be captured to prevent entry into the river.</li> <li>• Construction work would not impact protected species or river water quality.</li> <li>• The levee would not be modified or impacted during this project.</li> <li>• Repairs would begin once the state highway bridge construction was completed due to closure of the bridge during construction.</li> </ul> <p>Project Funding Source and Construction Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal Highway Administration funding 80% and County funding 20%.</li> </ul> <p>Project Schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize design in 2021, construction to possibly start in 2022 and complete in 2023, but pending on completion of state Hanapēpē Bridge.</li> </ul> <p>Questions and Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ms. Larson asked when the ADA mitigation was installed. Mr. Moule stated the road ADA access with the bollard barriers were probably installed once the walkway was closed and may have been there for nine years.</li> <li>2. Ms. Larson inquired how long the spalling and cracking repairs last. Mr. Kincaid replied repairs would have a life span of 25-40 years.</li> </ol>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>3. Ms. Larson asked what the original bridge road covering was. Mr. Moule replied it was macadam.</p> <p>4. Ms. Larson asked if the original bridge road was a concrete bottom, a layer of gravel and macadam on top. Mr. Moule replied yes.</p> <p>5. Ms. Larson asked what the original elevated pedestrian walkway surface was made of. Mr. Moule replied it was reinforced concrete. Mr. Kincaid added that the current surface was the original material.</p> <p>6. Ms. Larson asked if they thought of alternatives to the current ADA walkway. Mr. Moule replied the original plan was to remove the elevated pedestrian walkway and lower it down to bridge level and that would make it ADA accessible. Other options included installation of ramps attached to both ends of the walkway.</p> <p>7. Ms. Larson asked if there were other options to the bollards that delineated the ADA walkway across the bridge. Mr. Moule replied that it could be raised to a normal sidewalk height, raised asphalt curb (bump).</p> <p>8. Vice Chair Remoaldo commented that the bollards were consistently run over by cars and was not a safe barrier, it was also unsightly.</p> <p>9. Mr. Guerber thanked Mr. Moule and Mr. Kincaid for the sensitivity in preserving the historic bridge. He said the look of the bollards do not belong in that area and detracts from the aesthetics of the bridge. He said another option would be to use the State bridge as the alternative ADA access. Mr. Moule replied that an asphalt curb was permanent and the bollards were temporarily placed to outline the designated ADA area but was not placed as a safety barrier.</p> <p>10. Ms. Larson commented that the bollards were ugly and asphalt curb (bump) would be better. She appreciated the raised walkway and the improvements to the railings. Mr. Moule replied that another option would be to mark the area with a white stripe. Mr. Kincaid suggested a white stripe with a rumble strip could be another alternative.</p> <p>11. Mr. Long preferred a white stripe, rumble strip or asphalt curb instead of the bollards.</p> <p>12. Mr. Guerber commented he preferred the bridge restored back to its original historic look.</p> <p>13. Ms. Summers commented that if they were using Federal funds it would be mandatory to provide ADA accessibility. Mr. Moule said they probably would need to.</p> <p>14. Mr. Long commented that the barrier material should be consistent with the secretary of interior standards of rehabilitation for the historic integrity of the bridge</p>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to accept the County of Kaua'i</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>Department of Public Works – Engineering Division            Hanapēpē Bridge Rehabilitation Project Federal-Aid Project Number: BR-0545(1), Tax Map Key(s): (4) 1-9-007-013, (4) 1-9-011-012, (4) 1-9-011:999 (ROW)            National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties project with the requests to mitigate the look of the bollards used to delineate the ADA access across the bridge. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
	<p><b>I.3. County of Kaua'i Department of Public Works – Engineering Division Po'ipū Road Multi-Modal Improvements</b>            Federal-Aid Project Number: STP-0520(004)            Multiple Tax Map Key(s)            National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties.</p> <p><i>Chair Ida called for a recess at 4:26 p.m.</i>  <i>Chair Ida called the meeting back to order at 4:31 p.m.</i></p> <p>County of Kaua'i Chief Engineer of Public Works Michael Moule presented the project to the commission and introduced Engineer and Project Manager Christie Bagley. He shared a power point presentation.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Po'ipū road project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements encompass Po'ipū road from Kōloa road ends just before the Hyatt.</li> <li>• The improvements came from design workshops held with the public, large landowners and the surrounding resorts. The meetings and workshops gathered ideas and identified values and priorities and eight overarching improvement ideas.</li> <li>• The improvements would include the addition of two new roundabouts, raised medians, crosswalk flashing beacons, sidewalks, bike lanes and additional parking.</li> </ul> <p>Design plan concept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add bike lanes designated with one or two white stripes and sidewalks on either side to most of Po'ipū road.</li> <li>• Po'ipū road by Waikomo road may eliminate the triangle island, narrow the curb sidewalk, add designated bike lanes on both sides of the road and sidewalks on both sides.</li> <li>• Po'ipū road by Kiahuna golf course would have a bike lane and sidewalk on the golf course side; there would be no sidewalk or bike lane on the other side, the west side.</li> <li>• Po'ipū road by Kōloa Landing and Po'ipū Beach Estates intersection; remove decelerate and acceleration lanes to shorten crosswalk for a safer pedestrian crossing.</li> <li>• Po'ipū road by the resort areas would be one lane in each direction, raised median or turn lane, bike lanes buffered and eight foot width sidewalks on both sides.</li> <li>• Add a roundabout by Kiahuna Plantation drive by Keoki's; identified several rock walls that were not historic and built with the develop of the shopping village and would dismantle and place the rock wall further back. Designing roundabout to avoid the large trees and identified a historic rock wall that set back the roundabout to keep away from the area.</li> <li>• Add a roundabout by Ala Kinoiki bypass road.</li> <li>• Po'ipū road by Hoowili road, identified several rock walls, one definitely historic, another one may be historic and the others were made during development of the area. The Po'ipū Beach Athletic Club had plans to modify their entrance to avoid driving over part of Hapa Road trail. They are in the process and it may be completed before the start of this project.</li> </ul>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Questions and comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Long asked if there was an archaeological investigation or study done. Mr. Moule replied there was an archaeological review or survey done and they're aware of several major historic properties which are the Kōloa field system and old railroad that ran from Kōloa mill to Kōloa landing that was probably removed when Po'ipū road was done. There was also the sloped area by the entrance to Po'ipū beach park that would have a sidewalk either inland or closer to the road. He said the area had not been disturbed and it may involve excavation work. They are still pending advice and in the consultation process with SHPD.</li> <li>2. Mr. Long asked if archaeological monitoring would be present during construction. Mr. Moule replied that once section 106 is finalized they would follow SHPD recommendations.</li> <li>3. Ms. Larson asked for clarification on the bike lanes. Mr. Moule confirmed that the bike lanes were part of the highway and designated with one or two white stripes on the asphalt.</li> <li>4. Ms. Larson asked about any rehabilitation plans with Hapa Trail Road or the Kōloa Field System. Mr. Moule replied that it was not part of the project.</li> <li>5. Chair Ida expressed concerns of historic remnants along the sloped area by the entrance to Po'ipū beach. He inquired on the measurements of the setback from the sidewalk to Po'ipū road. Mr. Moule measured 30 feet. Chair Ida asked that the commission receive copies of the archaeological report or survey or literature review. Mr. Moule said it was an archaeological literature review and he would provide that to the commission.</li> <li>6. Chair Ida was also concerned that the roundabout would encroach into Kiahuna drive and there may be historic remnants there also. Mr. Moule said the roundabout area was already disturbed by the development of the shopping village and road. Chair Ida said the roundabout was close to the railroad berm. Mr. Moule showed that the roundabout area was outside of the berm.</li> </ol>	<p>Mr. Long moved to accept the County of Kaua'i Department of Public Works – Engineering Division Po'ipū Road Multi-Modal Improvements Federal-Aid Project Number: STP-0520(004), Multiple Tax</p>



SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties project to the next meeting. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
	<p><b>I.5. Hawai'i Department of Transportation and Federal Highways Administration Programmatic Agreement for Minor Hawai'i Historic Bridge Projects Statewide</b>            National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa advised the commission that the consultation 106 process for this project is ongoing and they have the option to defer to the next meeting or hear the presentation now.</p> <p>Project Manager Mr. Ikaika Kincaid and Hawai'i Department of Transportation Planning Department Ms. Pua Aiu were amicable to return and present at the next meeting; however, Mr. Kincaid said it was just a notification and he could run through the presentation swiftly.</p> <p>Mr. Kincaid presented the project and shared a power point presentation.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to defer the 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 until the next meeting. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion.</p> <p>Ms. Larson withdrew her motion.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>He said it was a statewide project that would include all qualified historic bridges throughout the state. Included in the project were the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, State of Hawai'i Department of Transportation through Planning Department Pua Aiu, CONSOR Engineers, Mason Architects, Hunter Research Inc. and Honua Consulting.</p> <p>Purpose of project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a programmatic agreement for historic bridges that would streamline the process and repair of minor rehabilitation projects that would not affect or have minor effects on historic properties.</li> </ul> <p>Scope of Programmatic Agreement (PA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would address ongoing maintenance repairs and minor rehabilitation that would have no effect or minor effects on historic bridges.</li> <li>• Would not address major bridge rehabilitation or replacement and projects with an effect to archaeological resources and previously undisturbed areas where archaeological resources may be present.</li> </ul> <p>Historic Bridge Inventory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The statewide inventory was completed in 2013 and stored in an electronic file.</li> </ul> <p>Next step:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In process of completing a best practices manual draft of the PA and using the AASHTO (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) Historic Bridge Preservation Guide manual as reference in the development of the draft.</li> <li>• Complete first draft and present to commission July to September</li> <li>• Present draft at a public meeting in September</li> </ul> <p>Other Information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation protocol to register and participate in the historic bridge PA:  <a href="http://HawaiiHistoricBridgePA.com/4ABL">http://HawaiiHistoricBridgePA.com/4ABL</a> access to review and comment</li> </ul>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project is in process and timeline is another year to complete PA guidance manual</li> <li>• Leveraging Federal funds to complete small historic bridge repairs</li> </ul>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to receive the 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 report and requested the consultants return with a progress report and draft of the Programmatic Agreement manual for the commission to review. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
	<p><b>I.6. Hanapēpē Readiness Center ( Hawai'i Army National Guard)</b>            1-3460 Kaumuali'i Hwy            Tax Map Key: (4) 1-8-008:029 and 078            Hanapēpē, Kaua'i</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 consultation for the proposed installation of two new 80 foot tall, 60 foot wide (turning radius), 25-kilowatt rotatable high frequency (HF) antennas at the Hanapēpē Readiness Center (RC), and the finding of "no adverse effects" to historic properties.</p> <p>a. Director's Report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa advised that in the supplemental packet the commission received</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>communication from the air national guard dated February 12, 2021 from Mr. Heath Conkle requesting to defer the presentation to the next meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa advised the commission that the applicant for I.7. temporarily left the meeting and the commission could either take a recess or have I.8., present now. Chair Ida requested I.8. present next and I.7. could present after.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to defer the Hanapēpē Readiness Center (Hawai'i Army National Guard) 1-3460 Kaumuali'i Hwy, Tax Map Key: (4) 1-8-008:029 and 078, Hanapēpē, Kaua'i presentation to the next meeting. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
<p><b>I. New Business Zoning Permit Reviews:</b></p>	<p><b>I.8. Aloha Theatre Restoration</b>          3795 Hanapēpē Road          Tax Map Key: (4) 1-9-004-013          Hanapēpē, Hawai'i</p> <p>Applicant's status update of the proposed project, KHPRC review of the revised design plans, and request for an updated letter of support from the KHPRC.</p> <p>Owner Lynn Danaher presented the project and shared a power point presentation.</p> <p>Update on the project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completed Phase 1 of demolition, stabilization and clean up in September 2019.</li> <li>2. Due to COVID19, Phase 1 costs and dramatic increase in construction material took action to seek funding from SBA and USDA to complete reconstruction and received advice to revise plans and eliminate theatre, restaurant and 12 unit additional building.</li> <li>3. Seeking approval for a modified permit to move forward with Phase 2. The revised plans eliminated the restaurant, beer and wine balcony, theatre and 12 unit additional building. The revised plans on the ground floor added a café, spa/salon, flex space, gallery/hotel office and ADA rooms.</li> </ol>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Phase 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Original permit is still open, but she now needs to obtain a modified permit to complete the façade portion of the building which is only 25% of the revised plan.</li> <li>2. Modified permit would include: complete ground floor façade with café, gallery and office and second floor two hotel suites with balcony in the area originally designated for the beer and wine bar.</li> </ol> <p>Questions and comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Long asked for photos of the façade; the original and new one. Ms. Danaher showed an artist rendering and architect drawing.</li> <li>2. Mr. Long asked for the difference in the façade elevation from the new to the original. Ms. Danaher replied they were similar.</li> <li>3. Mr. Long asked why the original Aloha Sweet Shop entry door did not meet current code. Ms. Danaher said there were two doors at two feet wide each and the new code for a commercial building was a minimum two doors at three feet wide each. Mr. Long commented that the original two feet wide doors could be made into one door and that would meet code. He said you do not need to have two doors it could be one four foot wide door.</li> <li>4. Mr. Long inquired why alternatives were not used to keep the large plate glass windows like the original façade. He said you could possibly mitigate the problem by use of glaze over the plate glass window for structure and safety. Ms. Danaher said she referred to the international building code.</li> <li>5. Mr. Long requested further research on the door and window of the façade.</li> <li>6. Mr. Long questioned the second floor. Ms. Danaher said during demolition they discovered a large gap between the ground floor ceiling and second floor, which served no purpose in the new plans. They dropped the ceiling and gained additional height on the second floor that provided a balcony on the façade.</li> <li>7. Mr. Long commented that it was difficult to judge existing and proposed changes to the elevation and requested plans of existing front elevation.</li> <li>8. Mr. Long asked if her architect expressed any issues with the changes to the size of the plate glass windows. Ms. Danaher said the architect agreed with her and did not have any issues with the changes.</li> </ol>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>9. Ms. Larson agreed with Mr. Long and also wanted to see more details of the façade. She hoped alternatives could be used to keep the original facade.</p> <p>10. Ms. Remoaldo asked if the new FEMA flood zone map affected the theatre flood zone area. Ms. Danaher said no, but she was eligible for flood insurance and advise to purchase.</p> <p>Planner Alex Wong said the applicant requested a letter of support to take to a lender. He said the request was to support proposed changes to the original presentation that she brought before the commission over a year ago or suggest potential changes to her presentation today or to not. Ms. Danaher said its approval of a modified permit. Mr. Wong reiterated to clarify approval of a modified permit to complete the façade and rooms in the façade. Mr. Wong commented the additional rooms regarding the West Kaua'i Community Plan Update allowed for motel use and development and highly recommended speaking with Planning Department once she was ready to add the additional 19 hotel rooms.</p> <p>There was a lengthy discussion between the commission, Ms. Danaher and the staff as to what they should motion, what they could request and what was approved in 2019. Ms. Danaher came before the commission in 2019 and the commission approved her request.</p>	<p>Mr. Long moved to defer the Aloha Theatre Restoration at 3795 Hanapēpē Road, Tax Map Key: (4) 1-9-004-013 Hanapēpē, Hawai'i project until the applicant provides the commission with floor plans and elevations that are not artist renderings of the historic building and proposed new building that include detailed specifications on the plate glass windows, door design and how the proposed new elevation would look like next to the historical features. Ms. Larson seconded the motion.</p> <p>Mr. Long withdrew his motion.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>Chair Ida experienced internet problems and repeatedly disconnected and regained access back into the meeting between 6:20 p.m. and 6:30 p.m.</i></p> <p>The commission requested to view the documents that were included in the 2019 presentation that was approved by the commission. Mr. Wong shared documents the commission reviewed from their 2019 meeting that confirmed the same documents were used and approved by the commission. Mr. Long said the proposed elevations were substantially different from the 2019 documents they reviewed and approved in comparison to the current documents they reviewed.</p>	<p>Mr. Long moved to defer the Aloha Theatre Restoration 3795 Hanapēpē Road, Tax Map Key: (4) 1-9-004-013 Hanapēpē, Hawai'i project until the next meeting until the applicant provides the commission floor plans and front exterior elevations of the historic building façade and proposed new building facade.</p> <p>Mr. Long withdrew his motion.</p> <p>Mr. Guerber moved to approve the Aloha Theatre Restoration 3795 Hanapēpē Road, Tax Map Key: (4) 1-9-004-013 Hanapēpē, Hawai'i project and allow the applicant to complete the façade. Mr. Long seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
	<p><b>I.7. Gulick Rowell House Restoration</b>            9567 Huakai Road            Tax Map Key: (4) 1-2-006:034            Waimea, Hawai'i</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Consideration of the subject parcel and existing historic building for proposed repair of the roof and other structural improvements to the lanai that would enable effective fumigation of the structure.</p> <p>a. Director's Report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p>Mr. Wong read portions of the Director's Report dated February 18, 2021 for the record. He reminded the commission that this property was on both the national and state register of historic places. (<i>Document on file</i>)</p> <p>Mason Architects, Glen Mason presented the project and shared documents. He reviewed the history of Gulick Rowell House.</p> <p>Findings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Displayed a site plan</li> <li>2. Huge tree next to the house was probably there from 1897</li> <li>3. Oldest building on Kaua'i and probably the top 4-5 in the Hawai'i</li> <li>4. Lanai was originally constructed of wood and changed in 1927</li> <li>5. Home would be reconstructed to its 1927 period</li> </ol> <p>Propose:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Make necessary repairs to roof and lanai to secure and stabilize the building so it could be tented for termite fumigation.</li> </ol> <p>Mr. Mason reviewed the history of Gulick Rowell House and said immediate urgent action was required to repair the roof and lanai so the house could be termite treated. Within a year he documented extensive termite damage and highlighted significant areas in the home that were original and in danger of being lost due to termites. He said once termite treated they would be able to return and begin to prevent it from collapsing and reconstruct it historically and accurately to the 1927 period.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Wong said the commission could support, support with specific conditions or recommendations or to not support the proposed roof and structural repair and renovation as presented. Mr. Mason asked the commission to the permit was to make the necessary repairs to the roof and lanai structure to get the building stabilized to take care of the termite issue. There would be another permit and presentation once interior work is ready.</p> <p><i>Chair Ida experienced internet problems and disconnected from the meeting around 7:03 p.m.</i></p> <p>With Chair Ida absent Chair Pro Tem Remoaldo led the meeting.</p>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to strongly support and approve the Gulick Rowell House Restoration, 9567 Huakai Road, Tax Map Key: (4) 1-2-006:034, Waimea, Hawai'i, Consideration of the subject parcel and existing historic building for proposed repair of the roof and other structural improvements to the lanai that would enable effective fumigation of the structure. Ms. Larson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.</p>
<p><b>I. New Business Nominations:</b></p>	<p><b>I.9. Nomination to the State Historic Register</b>  <b>Princeville Ranch Manager House and Caretaker Cottage</b>            5470 Weke Rd.            Tax Map Key: (4) 5-5-004:006            Hanalei, Hawai'i</p> <p>Consideration of historic buildings on the subject property for nomination to the State Historic Register.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>a. Director's Report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p><i>Commissioner Steven Long recused himself from the meeting at 7:06 p.m. and Chair Ida had not reconnected back into the meeting; the commission did not have quorum from 7:06 p.m.</i></p> <p>Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa stated with only four commissioners in the meeting they did not have quorum and advised they could listen to the presentation; however they would not be able to make a decision. Chair Pro Tem Remoaldo agreed to continue the presentation.</p> <p>Planner Marisa Valenciano said the action for the commission was to support the nomination or to not support the nomination by either not supporting or receiving the nomination for the record and read portions of the Director's Report for the record. The Department recommended support for the nomination based on Criteria A and C. (Document on file)</p> <p>Owner, Robert Trent Jones, Jr. presented information of the property with a power point presentation.</p> <p><i>Chair Ida experienced internet problems regained access back into the meeting around 7:10 p.m. but disconnected again and regained access back into the meeting.</i></p> <p>He and his family have been owners of the property for 50 years and gave a history. In 1992, Hurricane Iniki caused some roof and window damages to the main home that were repaired and have since been mainly untouched. The cottage had more damage and was rebuilt and enlarged with a lanai added.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to support the Princeville Ranch Manager House and Caretaker Cottage, 5470 Weke Rd. Tax Map Key: (4) 5-5-004:006, Hanalei, Hawai'i nomination to the Hawai'i State Historic Register. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		carried: 5-Ayes, 0-Nays and 1-Recused (Mr. Long).
<b>J. Announcements</b>	<b>J.1. Waimea 400 Update</b> Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa said the master plan was currently being worked on and more updates would be shared later.	
<b>K. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics (DATE)</b>	Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa announced the next meeting would be March 18, 2021 at 1:30 p.m. <i>Commissioner Steven Long returned back to the meeting 7:32 p.m.</i> Mr. Long requested the following agenda items; 1. Status on PLG funds 2. West Side Historic Inventory PIG (Permitted Interaction Group) needs to be completed with Myles Hironaka	
<b>L. Adjournment</b>	With no further business to conduct, Chair Ida called for a motion to adjourn.	Ms. Larson moved to adjourn the meeting. Vice Chair Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.  Chair Ida adjourned the meeting at 7:35pm

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sandra M. Muragin, Commission Support Clerk

Reviewed and Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gerald Ida, Chair

( X ) Approved as circulated. 08/19/21

( ) Approved with amendments. See minutes of \_\_\_\_\_ meeting.