

COUNTY OF KAUA'I
Minutes of Meeting
OPEN SESSION

Board/Commission:	Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission	Meeting Date	June 17, 2021
Location	Teleconference by Microsoft Teams	Start of Meeting: 1:31 p.m.	End of Meeting: 3:28 p.m.
Present	Chair Gerald Ida. Vice Chair Susan Remoaldo. Commissioners: James Guerber, Carolyn Larson, Stephen Long and Aubrey Summers. Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall. Planning Department Staff: Deputy Planning Director Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa, Planner Marisa Valenciano, Commission Specialist Shanlee Jimenez and Planner Myles Hironaka. Office of Boards and Commissions: Administrator Ellen Ching and Commission Support Clerk Sandra Muragin.		
Excused			
Absent			
SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
A. Call To Order	Chair Ida called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.		
B. Roll Call	Deputy Planning Director Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa verified attendance by roll call and requested a verbal response; Commissioner Guerber replied here. Commissioner Larson replied here . Commissioner Long replied here. Commissioner Summers replied here. Vice Chair Remoaldo replied here. Chair Ida replied here.	Quorum was established with six commissioners present.	
C. Approval of the Agenda	Mr. Long requested that the minimum requirements for a project presentation before KHPRC be placed on the next agenda.	Mr. Guerber moved to approve the June 17, 2021 agenda, as circulated. Ms. Larson seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.	
D. Approval of the Minutes	Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa announced there were no minutes to approve.		
E. Communications	There were none.		

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
F. Public Comment	Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa announced that any member of the public could now testify on any agenda item. Hearing no response, she moved on to the next agenda item.	
G. General Business Matters	There were none.	
H. Unfinished Business	<p>H.1. 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 National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 consultation for the proposed installation of two new rotatable high frequency (HF) antennas at the Hanapēpē Readiness Center (HRC).</p> <p>a. Email (5/26/2021) from MAJ (RET) Jeff Hickman transmitting slides. b. Email (5/28/2021) from MAJ (RET) Jeffrey D. Hickman transmitting pictures and architectural drawings of antenna. c. Supplemental #1 to the Director's Report pertaining to this matter</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commission's action was to provide comments and directions that would generate a Section 106 response letter to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concur or not concur with the agency's findings and provide comments on the project ○ Decline to comment ○ Defer comments until more information becomes available • At the March 18, 2021, meeting the commission requested the agency provide an alternative design and location for the antenna towers. • The department cleared up the overall height of the towers with the agency. In February 2020 the materials received indicated the tower height at 80 feet, but after receiving architectural drawings for the June 17, 2021, meeting the applicant confirmed that the height of the tower, including the rotating antenna top, was 95 feet. • In their February 2020 application the agency noted the antenna turning radius was 60 feet, which the agency corrected, and it should have been 60 degrees. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>The Planning Department conveyed that the antennas would be in proximity and adjacent to significant historic properties and recommended the commission submit a Section 106 letter that did not concur with the agency's determination of no effect to historic properties and provided a sample motion: "move to submit a Section 106 comment letter memorializing KHPRC decision to not concur with the agency's determination of no adverse effect to historic properties. The Section 106 comments should also convey concerns about the proposed design of the towers and its visual and scenic impact to nearby historic properties".</p> <p>State of Hawai'i (SOH) Department of Defense, Director of Public Affairs Jeffrey Hickman shared a power point presentation that addressed the commissions comments from the March 18, 2021, meeting;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project Review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The antennas would be for emergency use and provide communication capabilities for Kaua'i and Hawai'i after a disaster. • Construction cost of the towers would be federally subsidized. • Hawai'i State Historic Preservation Office concurred the project. 2. Sea level rise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Pacific Islands Ocean Observing System determined the property site would not be affected by a 0.5-to-3.2-foot sea level rise. • Towers would not be impacted by a category three hurricane storm surge. • Property site was outside of the 100-year flood zone. 3. Other sites considered and reasoning why not chosen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternate sites were considered and evaluated based on three criteria's and the HRC property ranked first: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Federally owned property ○ Site located in an assessable location ○ Area safe from natural disasters 4. Other designs considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The chosen antenna model had a 360 turning radius that was the most effective in 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>communication signals that other models did not have.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looked at mobile versions and one that erected when needed, but those did not offer the same capability. • Both towers are required. One to receive and the other to transmit at the same time. The towers communicate by radio, voice, and text. • The main reason for two antennas was it provided redundancy of operations. <p>5. Photos of the area (actual on the ground photos – see slide 6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View 1 – looking makai down Puolo Road from Kaumuali'i Highway. • View 2 – from the end of Puolo Road looking mauka. • View 3 – diagonal view from Kaumuali'i Highway across the street with sight of temple. <p>6. Disagreement of the “no significant effect/impact...” from SHPD letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments shared <p>7. Other sites on Kaua'i that have taller/higher than these antennas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 357 ft tall tower in 'Ele'ele • 190 ft tall tower in Kekaha • 200, 165 and 150 ft tall towers at Pacific Missile Range Facility • 159 ft tower in Po'ipū • 150 ft tower in Kōloa • 127 ft building in Hanamā'ulu • Five 80 ft tall stadium lights at Hanapēpē Stadium • 20-four ft tall power poles around the immediate area <p>8. Alternate communication types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Virginal National Guard Emergency Management Specialist and Adjunct Professor at Georgetown University Anthony Hammerquist said the towers offered post disaster communication when communication infrastructure failed during and after a disaster. • Radio communication allowed the ability to talk to multiple calls at the same time. • The antennas could communicate interisland, mainland, to aircraft and ship. <p>9. Include new (other) graphics and drawings (slide 7):</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displayed updated architectural drawings <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Larson asked if the antenna towers could be suitable in the other sites that were considered. Mr. Hammerquist said the other areas considered had existing antennas that would interfere with the effectiveness of the communication transmission. Existing antennas surrounding the towers, near aircraft, mountain terrain or lack of space would be unsuitable. 2. Ms. Larson asked for the wingspan of the antenna arm. Mr. Hickman responded each arm of the antenna was 30 feet on either side, with a 60 feet circumference. He also noted for visibility purpose the antennas in the photo were colored black but would be a silver-gray color. 3. Ms. Larson asked if the arms of the antenna were vulnerable to hurricane winds. Mr. Hammerquist said the antennas were rated for a category four hurricane resistance. Ms. Larson found it concerning that a category five hurricane could possibly take down the antenna. 4. Vice Chair Remoaldo asked if they could share the alternate sites considered. Mr. Hammerquist and Mr. Hickman did not have the information at the time and would provide a list to the commission. 5. Mr. Long asked if the antenna rotated 60 or 360 degrees. Mr. Hammerquist replied 360 degrees. 6. Mr. Long said cellphones were non-existent and wanted to know what problems would be solved with the antennas. Mr. Hammerquist said the report from the Hawai'i civil emergency service after Hurricane Iniki noted all communications were down, antennas toppled over and there was no way to assess the devastation until they placed people on the ground or scheduled a flight inspection. Other sites considered were Moloka'i and Barking Sands and neither would be suitable for the antennas. They also looked at other islands. 7. Mr. Long said the responsibility of this commission was historic and not communication. He said he disagreed with the archaeologist suggestion of no visual impact and suggested a Section 106 letter commenting that the antenna towers would have a negative visual effect 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>on the surrounding historic properties.</p> <p>8. Chair Ida commented that he had a cellphone and after three days his cellphone reached O'ahu. He understood the importance of communication, but the commissions task was historic.</p> <p>9. Ms. Larson concurred and acknowledged communication was an issue but the major responsibility of KHPRC was historic.</p> <p>Ms. Larson commented that the community should have input on the proposed location of the antenna towers. She appreciated the project just not appropriate at the Hanapēpē site. The other commissioners agreed.</p> <p>Hawai'i Air National Guard Compliance Manager Karl Bromwell stated that the antenna radius was 35 feet and explained that the antenna would not affect the surrounding nine historic properties that were about half mile away and that the temple next door would reach historic status in 2027. He was not aware of any registered view plains in the area and</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to approve a Section 106 letter memorializing KHPRC decision to not concur with the agency's determination of no adverse effect to historic properties for 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, National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 consultation for the proposed installation of two new rotatable high frequency (HF) antennas at the Hanapēpē Readiness Center (HRC). Mr. Guerber seconded the motion.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>emphasized the need to understand what specific historic properties the proposed project would have an adverse effect on. He questioned how the project would diminish the integrity and criteria that made the surrounding historic properties eligible. Mr. Hickman commented that the commission made a motion and was about to vote.</p> <p>Deputy County Attorney Hall jumped in and said the commission had their discussion and further comments should be specific to the motion on the floor; however, the commission could back track and address Mr. Bromwell's concerns, if they wanted to.</p> <p>Vice Chair Remoaldo commented that other community organizations, not included on the distribution list, would also want to comment on the project. Mr. Hickman said he submitted requests to the organizations listed and published an advertisement in the Garden Island Newspaper but did not receive any response.</p> <p>With no further discussion required from the commission Chair Ida called for the vote.</p>	<p>Roll Call vote Ayes-5 and Nay-1 (Ms. Summers). Motion carried 5:1.</p>
	<p>H.2. County of Kaua'i, Department of Public Works – Engineering Division. Improvements to Collector Road, Portions of Olohena Road, Kukui Street, and Ulu Street, Federal-Aid Project STP 0700(85), TMK: (4) 4-3-003:999, (4) 4-4-005:999, (4) 4-4-006:999, (4) 4-5-008:999, (4) 4-5-009:999, (4) 4-5-010:999, & (4) 4-5-015:003. National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Letter (5/27/2021) from Michael Moule, P.E., Chief, Engineering Division transmitting the final construction plans. b. Archeological Inventory Survey for Proposed Improvements to Collector Roads – Portion of Olohena Road, Kukui Street, and Ulu Street. c. Director's Report pertaining to this matter. <p>Ms. Valenciano shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commission's action was to provide comments and directions that would generate a 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Section 106 response letter to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concur or not concur with the agency's findings of no adverse effect to historic properties and provide comments on the project ○ Decline to comment ○ Defer comments until more information becomes available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Read portions of the Director's Report dated June 17, 2021 ● February 20, 2020 meeting the commission approved the project with restrictions. ● Public Works would present its final designs that include some of the commission's comments. ● Department recommends KHPRC submit a Section 106 comment letter that either concurs or not concur with the agency's findings of no effect to historic properties. The comment letter should include comments or concerns on the final design plans and whether the conversion of a single-lane to a double-lane bridge keeps the historic character of the area. ● This pertains only to phase 1; the project was a split into phase 1 and phase 2. <p>County of Kaua'i Chief Engineer of Public Works Michael Moule presented the project to the commission and with him were Public Works Project Engineer Joel Bautista. He shared a power point presentation Olohena Road Improvements Project which displayed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Site location map ● Existing Bridge – view to the east and southwest ● Abutment under the bridge on west side ● Western wing wall - mauka west side ● Eastern wing wall - mauka on Kapa'a side ● Western wing wall - downstream west side ● Eastern wing wall - downstream Kapa'a side ● Upstream parapet ● Downstream parapet ● KHPRC motion on February 18, 2020: "...recommend the project with the following restrictions: that we retain the wing walls and the cut stone and as much of the old bridge as possible underneath the new bridge and that the new parapets emulate the parapets on the old bridge as much as possible." 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to the bridge: expand the length of bridge, expand the existing abutments, remove the bridge parapets. The existing deck, wingwalls and channel walls will remain. • Proposed improvements – layout plan • Proposed improvements – street view • Proposed improvements – elevations • Proposed improvements – demo section view • Proposed improvements – completed section view • Pending concurrence from SHPD – if SHPD concurs project will move forward as shown; if SHPD does not concur, County will review requirements and revise as necessary <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Long thanked Mr. Moule for listening and incorporating KHPRC comments into the design which showed they were sensitive to the commissions historical concerns. 2. Ms. Larson inquired on the height of the road level on the bridge above the road level of the existing bridge. Mr. Moule replied there was a six-inch gap from the bottom of the new bridge over the old bridge. The new bridge was twenty-six inches higher than the old bridge. 3. Ms. Larson commented that the height of the new parapet was considerably higher than the original one. Mr. Moule replied that the new parapet was three feet six inches high and standard bridge rail height for crash safety. 4. Ms. Larson was concerned over the differences in the design from the old to new, it was higher off the ground and wider and taller. 5. Ms. Larson commented that the new bridge design did not retain the historical feel of the original bridge. She wanted input from the community to establish if a two-lane roadway was necessary. The design fit a two-lane bridge, but it did not maintain the historic feel of the original bridge with the modern industrial guardrails. She stated that based on the new design there was no possibility for KHPRC to concur with the findings of no effect to historic properties. 6. Vice Chair Remoaldo asked if the parapets were solid precast or casted on site. Mr. Moule was not sure. She said the original parapets had a rough concrete surface and asked if that could be recreated without compromising the safety requirements. Mr. Moule replied he 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>would refer this request to the consultants to provide an expert opinion.</p> <p>7. Mr. Long stated a mitigating factor would be to provide texture on the face of the concrete barrier parapets and echoed Ms. Larsons concerns.</p> <p>8. Ms. Larson remembered that the Historic Hawai'i Foundation was conducting a study on bridges and wondered if this bridge could qualify or gain from any guidelines they may have.</p> <p>Mr. Moule advised Ms. Larson to rephrase her motion from “findings of no adverse effect to historic properties” to “findings of no historic properties affected”.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to not concur with the agency’s findings of no adverse effect to historic properties. <i>(motion died with no second)</i></p> <p>Ms. Larson moved to not concur with the agency’s findings of no historic properties affected for the County of Kaua’i, Department of Public Works – Engineering Division. Improvements to Collector Road, Portions of Olohena Road, Kukui Street, and Ulu Street, Federal-Aid Project STP 0700(85), TMK: (4) 4-3-003:999, (4) 4-4-005:999, (4) 4-4-006:999, (4) 4-5-008:999, (4) 4-5-009:999, (4) 4-5-010:999, & (4) 4-5-015:003. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Roll Call vote Ayes-6 and Nay-0. Motion carried 6:0.</p> <p>Mr. Long moved that the previous motion recognized</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>the existing historical bridge is affected and as mitigating measures accept the county's redesign elements presented to KHPRC at the 6/17/21 meeting and additional mitigating request is to investigate a material or textural facing design on the new concrete parapets or guardrails for the County of Kaua'i, Department of Public Works – Engineering Division. Improvements to Collector Road, Portions of Olohena Road, Kukui Street, and Ulu Street, Federal-Aid Project STP 0700(85), TMK: (4) 4-3-003:999, (4) 4-4-005:999, (4) 4-4-006:999, (4) 4-5-008:999, (4) 4-5-009:999, (4) 4-5-010:999, & (4) 4-5-015:003. Ms. Larson seconded the motion. Roll Call vote Aye-6 and Nay-0. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
I. New Business	There were none.	
J. Announcements	There were none.	
K. Selection of Next Meeting	<p>Next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, August 19, 2021 Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa said the agenda would include the minimum requirements for project</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Date and Agenda Topics (August 19, 2021)	<p>presentations before the commission and CLG (Certified Local Grant) fund update.</p> <p>Ms. Larson stated she would not be available for the August 19, 2021, meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Long requested the staff contact Ikaika Kincaid who presented historic bridges and shared the programmatic agreement to add one-lane bridges.</p>	
L. Adjournment	<p>With no further business to conduct, Chair Ida called for a motion to adjourn.</p>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to adjourn the meeting. Vice Chair Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p> <p>Chair Ida adjourned the meeting at 3:28pm</p>

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

Reviewed and Approved by: _____
 Gerald Ida, Chair

- () Approved as circulated.
- (X) Approved with amendments. See minutes of 10/21/21 meeting.