

COUNTY OF KAUA'I
Minutes of Meeting
OPEN SESSION

Board/Commission:		Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission	Meeting Date	October 21, 2021
Location	Zoom Teleconference		Start of Meeting: 1:30 p.m.	End of Meeting: 4:49 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: Commission Support Clerk Sandra Muragin.			
Excused	Administrator Ellen Ching			
Absent				
SUBJECT	DISCUSSION			ACTION
A. Call To Order	Chair Ida called the meeting to order at 1:30 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 present. 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. Guerber moved to approve the October 21, 2021 agenda, as circulated. Ms. Larson seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.
D. Approval of the Minutes	1. April 29, 2021 2. June 17, 2021 Ms. Larson requested the following corrections to the April 29, 2021 minutes; H. Unfinished Business page 5, Chair Ida called for a recess at 2:24 p.m. and Chair Ida reconvened the meeting			

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>at <u>2:20 p.m.</u>; correct recess time and time reconvened.</p> <p>Vice Chair Remoaldo requested correction to page 4, second paragraph; They plan to incorporate more landscape around the courtyard with sugar cane and <u>lawai</u> leaf; should be lauae leaf.</p> <p>Vice Chair Remoaldo inquired about the June 17, 2021 minutes, H. Unfinished Business page 6, bottom paragraph states; Hawai'i Air National Guard Compliance Manager Karl Bromwell stated that the antenna radius was <u>seven feet</u>, she didn't recall it being seven feet. Ms. Valenciano replied that she would check with the applicant. Ms. Larson requested a change on page 1, B. Roll Call, Commissioner Larson replied <u>merci</u> should be <u>here</u>.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to approve the April 29, 2021 minutes with the following corrections; correct time of recess and time reconvened on H. Unfinished Business page 5, Chair Ida called for a recess at 2:24 p.m., Chair Ida reconvened the meeting at 2:20 p.m. and word "lawai leaf" to "lauae leaf" on page 4 second sentence from the top and the June 17, 2021 minutes with the following corrections; B. Roll Call page 1, Commissioner Larson replied merci correct to here and H. Unfinished Business page 6, bottom paragraph seven feet, verify if seven feet was the correct information. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
<p>E. Communications</p>	<p>1. Letter from Reid Kawane, Chair of Charter Review Commission, requesting any proposals to amend the Charter.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall explained that the charter review commission started the process of gathering potential charter amendments and invited the commission to submit informal changes along with why the change should be made. All recommendations were reviewed by the charter review commission, and they decide if it should be placed on the ballot. Any proposals from this commission would be placed on the agenda for the commission to review, discuss and vote on.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Long asked if the county council also reviewed and voted on any proposed amendments. DCA Hall couldn't confirm but replied that the charter review commission reviewed all proposals and would decide which ones to place on the ballot for the public to vote on. <p>Ms. Larson recalled that Planning Director Ka'aina Hull mentioned that KHPRC was moving into a regulatory function and asked if this was a potential charter amendment. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa replied that KHPRC was created by county ordinance, and it was to advise the planning department and county on meeting its historic preservation roles. The commission had an advisory role and comments and recommendations, which are enforceable, are included into regulatory permits. DCA Hall suggested this discussion be agendized and functions of the commission explained at the next meeting. The commission agreed.</p>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to receive the letter from Reid Kawane, Chair of Charter Review Commission, requesting any proposals to amend the Charter. Ms. Larson seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
F. Public Comment	Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa announced no one from the public submitted testimony and should anyone from the public want to testify to register 24-hours prior to the start of the meeting.	
G. Consent Calendar	G.1. Lydgate Park-Kapa'a Bike/Pedestrian Path, Phase D Federal Aid Project No. STP-0700(088)	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Draft World War II Era Structures Interpretive Signage – Pillboxes Waipouli, North Olohena, and South Olohena Ahupua‘a Kawaihau District, island of Kaua‘i, Hawai‘i TMK: (4)4-3-002:001,013, 014,015,016,018,019,020; (4)4-3-007:027,028 HRS Chapter 6E-8 Historic Preservation Review.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Public Works Acting County Engineer Troy Tanigawa was available to answer questions • The commission’s action was to provide comments • Draft copy of the signage included in packet <p>Ms. Larson asked for an explanation of the new agenda item “consent calendar”. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said agenda items placed under consent calendar were for comments and if it required discussion, it would be moved into new business. She said planning commission used this, but in retrospect this agenda item should not have been placed there. DCA Hall confirmed that this did not prohibit the commission from having a discussion on the agenda item.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chair Ida asked for the dimensions and location of the sign. Acting County Engineer Tanigawa did not have the information available but would provide it later. He said the commission was being asked to comment on the information contained on the sign. 2. Ms. Larson asked if this was a mitigation due to destroying the structures or mitigation that the signs would recognize the former structure or structures. Mr. Tanigawa replied the proposal was to remove the concrete structure that was shown on the sign. 3. Ms. Larson asked if there were more than one sign in that section. Mr. Tanigawa replied he did not think so. 4. Ms. Larson asked if the photos were of one structure. Mr. Tanigawa replied that the picture in the center was the structure located on Kaua‘i. For context of what the Kaua‘i structure looked like it included similar outer island pictures. 5. Ms. Larson asked if there were multiple pill box structures on Kaua‘i. Mr. Tanigawa could 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>not confirm but could find out if the commission wanted that information.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano explained the project was originally managed by a recent retiree and Mr. Tanigawa was unfamiliar with the particulars of the project but tried his best to answer the commissions questions. She said they would list the questions and allow Mr. Tanigawa time to research and present the answers at another meeting.</p> <p>6. Ms. Larson requested information on the number of pill boxes left on Kaua'i and wanted to know why this was being destroyed if it could be the last remaining pill box structure.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa explained that the commission was to provide comments on the interpretive sign and discussion on the removal of the structure would be brought up later.</p> <p>7. Vice Chair Remoaldo and Mr. Guerber both commented they had difficulty reading the text on the copy provided and was unable to make comments on the sign information. They requested a clearer print.</p>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to receive the letter dated July 27, 2021 from Department of Public Works Acting County Engineer Troy K Tanigawa regarding the Lydgate Park-Kapa'a Bike/Pedestrian Path, Phase D, Federal Aid Project No. STP-0700(088), Draft World War II Era Structures Interpretive Signage-Pillboxes Waipouli, North Olohena, and South Olohena Ahupua'a Kawaihau District, island of Kaua'i, Hawai'i, TMK: (4)4-3-002:001,013,14,015,016,018,019,020; (4)4-3-007:027,028</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>8. Chair Ida pointed out that the document listed “Coast Defense Study Group” and requested more information about this group; which he had not heard about before.</p> <p>With no further discussion or questions, Chair Ida called for the vote.</p>	<p>HRS Chapter 6E-8 Historic Preservation Review and requested Mr. Tanigawa return with more facts and answers to their questions at another meeting. Ms. Larson seconded the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried 6:0.</p>
<p>H. Unfinished Business</p>	<p>There were none.</p>	
<p>I. New Business</p>	<p>I.1. Pacific Missile Range Facility (Department of Defense – Missile Defense Agency) Mānā, Hawai‘i TMK: (4) 1-2-002: 1,9,10,13,21,26,31,40 and 999 and (4) 1-2-016:1-11,17-20, 999 Section 106</p> <p>Section 106 Consultation for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) proposal to develop a plan to construct, test, and operate the Homeland Defense Radar – Hawai‘i (HDR-H) project that includes a missile defense radar system complex, and related actions in Hawai‘i.</p> <p>a. Director’s Report pertaining to this item.</p> <p>DCA Hall disclosed that Ms. Larson informed them of a conflict of interest; a family member was a paid consultant for this project. He said KHPRC rules stated that the commission was to find a conflict, and to note the conflict in the motion.</p>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to find a conflict of interest with Commissioner Carolyn Larson’s disclosure of a family member who was a paid consultant for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Missile</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>Commissioner Carolyn Larson exited the meeting at 2:09 p.m.</i></p> <p>Ms. Valenciano reviewed portions of the Director's Report dated October 21, 2021 (on file) and 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; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide comments ○ Defer comments until more information becomes available • The project was postponed but they were continuing with the environmental impact study to prepare for the launch the project once funding became available in the future. • Identified Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) as the preferred alternative site. • Project would cover approximately 50 acres, 85-foot radar and support facilities built on a raised earthen pad not to exceed 20 feet high. • The entire project should not exceed 105-feet in height. • The project would include temporary laydown areas for storage of construction material and permanent roadway for transporting materials and work equipment to the site. • The departments findings included that the project site had a potential for burials due to the sand and soil type and burials were previously found around the area. <p>HDR-H Environmental Manager and Lead Dr. Buff Crosby based in Alabama introduced the Hawai'i team; HDR-H Program Representative Charla Schreiber, and Consultants Dawn Chang and Jan TenBruggencate.</p> <p>HDR-H Program Representative Charla Schreiber shared parts of a 17-page power-point presentation titled Homeland Defense Radar Hawai'i (HDR-H) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Update and Preferred Alternative and provided an overview of the project;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congress approved a missile defense system in the State of Hawai'i due to advancing threats 	<p>Defense Agency project. Vice Chair Remoaldo seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Aye-6 Nay-0. Motion carried 6:0.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>in the region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project started in 2017, but in 2019, the Department of Defense postponed funding. • Studied the project site with PMRF colleagues to understand potential impacts. • Secured funding for radar production and EIS to prepare for a future construction start. • Displayed a conceptual rendering of the radar. The radar would be the largest structure in the complex that included 11- separate buildings. The 85 feet radar had 10 panels. Each panel measured 10x30 feet; a similar radar was constructed in Alaska. • Expected to complete a draft EIS by mid-2022. • Topographical picture of the HDR-H site layout located at the south end of PMRF. <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chair Ida inquired about the materials that would be used to construct the 20-foot pad. Ms. Schreiber said they were researching potential supply of construction grade fill. 2. Chair Ida asked for confirmation that the fill would not be from the PMRF area but brought in from the outside. Ms. Schreiber replied yes. 3. Chair Ida asked if the conduits and pipelines would be planted into the pad. Ms. Schreiber replied that some would be inserted into the pad. Borings would be done before construction of the pad to insert foundation pins that would secure the pad in place. <p>Consultant Dawn Chang shared they were in preliminary stages of the section 106 consultation that began with community outreach and cultural consultations. They've interviewed descendants that have stewarded their ancestors land and play an important role in the section 106 consultation. Ms. Chang stated the project would not impact any access to shoreline and would not adversely impact near shoreline activities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chair Ida inquired about the testimony email received October 18, 2021, from Michael Goodwin concerned with advancement in technology that made the HDR-H obsolete. Ms. Schreiber said its incorrect, and the HDR-H would still satisfy the missions requirements. 2. Chair Ida asked if this agenda item would come before the commission again. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated the applicant was in the section 106 process and the commission could state comments or request for more information which would allow the commission to review 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>again.</p> <p>3. Vice Chair Remoaldo stated she required additional information. The maps shown did not provide specific roads, sites, and familiar locations. She needed surrounding roads identified, names of valleys and beaches, locations of where endangered birds nested, Japanese cemetery and familiar locations on the base. She could develop comments and questions once she is able to assess where everything was in proximity to the complex.</p> <p>4. Mr. Guerber agreed with Vice Chair Remoaldo and said it's a huge decision and commented he would like to defer.</p> <p>Ms. Crosby said the draft impact statement document would be completed mid-2022 and would provide the additional description and details that Vice Chair Remoaldo requested. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa added that the commission would be asked to provide comments once the EIS draft was completed.</p> <p>DCA Hall said he gathered from the commissioners that they formed two options; request for more information or defer the matter.</p> <p>5. Chair Ida stated that he would need copies of archaeological reports. Ms. Chang replied they would request reports from PMRF.</p> <p>6. Chair Ida asked if the reports were specific to the project. Ms. Chang said the reports contained previous work done on PMRF in areas close to the site.</p> <p>Cultural Resource Specialists Architectural Historian Jeanne Barnes said previous archaeological surveys were done for the entire project site and plans were in place for additional surveys. The commission would be asked to comment on the reports once completed.</p> <p>Chair Ida said the request for comments on the project were too far in advance and lacked the necessary information to form a comment or ask questions.</p>	<p>Vice Chair Remoaldo moved to requests additional information with regards to the project. <i>(motion restated below)</i></p> <p>Vice Chair Remoaldo moved to request additional information about the Pacific Missile Range Facility</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>7. Chair Ida asked if they had an archaeological consultant. Ms. Barnes replied the consultant was International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc. (IARII). They have not secured an EIS consultant, but they would procure a local firm familiar with the unique PMRF site.</p> <p>Chair Ida requested the consultants return once they completed an archaeological survey and EIS. Vice Chair Remoaldo referenced cultural reports from Althea Kaohi and E. Kalani Flores that she would like the commission to review. She said the reports would provide important information.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that one of the options for the commission was to become a consulting party through the section 106 process. She said it's been done before but the timing of the section 106 consultation process was not always in line with the commissions scheduled meetings. Ms. Chang said the commission would have access to all information whether they decided to be a consultant or not.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa began the roll call vote and was not able to get a response from Commissioner Stephen Long. She asked Chair Ida to call for a five-minute recess.</p> <p><i>Chair Ida called for a recess at 3:13 p.m.</i> <i>Chair Ida reconvened the meeting at 3:17 p.m. once Commissioner Stephen Long was able to communicate.</i></p>	<p>(Department of Defense – Missile Defense Agency) Mānā, Hawai'i, TMK: (4) 1-2-002: 1,9,10,13,21,26,31,40 and 999 and (4) 1-2-016:1-11,17-20, 999; Section 106 as noted earlier and to include copies of previous archaeological and cultural reports for the commission to review before commenting on the project. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Higuchi proceeded with a roll call vote.</p>	<p>Roll Call Vote: Aye-5 Nay-0 Motion carried: 5:0</p>
	<p>I.2. Java Kai Old Kōloa Town Old Kōloa Town Building Renovation Lot 4A, Kōloa, Kaua'i, Hawai'i TMK: (4)2-8-007:016 Renovation of an existing structure</p> <p>a. Revised Plans b. Director's Report pertaining to this item.</p> <p><i>Commissioner Carolyn Larson logged back into the meeting at 3:19 p.m.</i></p> <p>Ms. Valenciano shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commission's action was to provide the following; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support the project ○ Recommend to the planning department conditions of approval for any zoning permit ○ Suggest recommendations to the planning department to consider denial of the permits ○ Recommend defer action on the permits • Read portions of the Director's Report dated October 21, 2021. <i>(Document on file)</i> • The Planning Department recommended the commission support the proposed renovations as represented. <p>Attorney Ian Jung introduced architect Kanoa Chung and presented the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared photos of the existing Kōloa History Center structure that would be converted to the Java Kai coffee shop along with proposed plans and a materials board. • Addressed Historic Hawai'i Foundation (HHF) two-page letter dated October 21, 2021, from Executive Director HHF Kiersten Faulkner comments on the swinging door panels, reposition and replacement of windows, siding and color palette. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vice Chair Remoaldo commented that HHF did not mention the roof top exhaust vent that should be disguised without interfering with its function. Mr. Jung said HHF reviewed the original plans that did not include the exhaust vent; they were in the supplemental plans to comply with department of health (DOH) regulations. Architect Kanoa Chung replied that he placed it to the rear of the roof to minimize view and the only other option would be to blend it into the landscape with paint. Mr. Chung said they explored reduction of the vent height, but it could not be altered to be compliant with DOH regulations. 2. Vice Chair Remoaldo asked if the existing windows could open. Mr. Chung said the existing windows do not open and the reason for the reposition and replacement was to provide airflow. 3. Vice Chair Remoaldo asked how the replacement windows opened. Mr. Chung said the windows were casement that would swing out to the eastside of the building. Casement provided a cleaner visual but was open to single or double hung windows. Vice Chair Remoaldo said the surrounding windows were double hung and it would blend into the surrounding area. 4. Chair Ida asked if the exterior wall was the one with the photos on. Mr. Chung said that was a middle wall and the exterior wall was behind. 5. Chair Ida asked if the middle wall was original. Mr. Chung replied it appeared to be original. 6. Chair Ida asked what was between the middle wall and exterior wall. Mr. Chung replied it was used as storage for historic material. 7. Chair Ida asked what would happen to the historic material. Mr. Jung replied plans were being worked on to exhibit the items. 8. Vice Chair Remoaldo referenced the architectural drawings on page 9 and pointed out the arched doorway that led from the front to the back work area. She questioned if the arch doorway was appropriate. Mr. Chung replied that the arch was a recognizable feature of the company's brand. <p>Ms. Larson wasn't sure how and when to bring up her concern that the entire complex had the potential to become registered as a historic district which would affect her support on the reuse of this building. Mr. Jung shared that the owner and long-term leaser are open and have already discussed applying for historic district status to maintain the historic integrity of the area. But</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>with the southside community plan pushing for reuse of old structures with restaurants and shops they were challenged with timing.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked the planning staff and wanted to discuss what steps were needed if the commission identified an historic district. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa replied that they had discussions with the owner and long-term leaser. A historic district designation would trigger an environmental impact statement (EIS) and environmental assessment (EA) under National and Hawai'i laws that would prevent rehabilitation in the district and potentially add to the cost and time.</p> <p>9. Ms. Larson asked the length of time it took to become a historic district. Ms. Jodi Sayegusa replied that the interior Hanapēpē bridge took over one year.</p> <p>Ms. Larson commented that although the structure was not historic and the area not identified as a historic district, they did not have a clear understanding of what the original building looked like, and it was a concern not only for this building but other projects. She said they want to maintain the historic nature of the area and want to support the reuse of the area but could not figure out how to get to that point if they do not even have a basic picture of the original building and what would constitute as historic integrity of the building. She said they were asked to allow small changes in this one area on this building and other buildings, but how could they gauge how far off these changes were from the original building. Ms. Valenciano responded that the department researched as much as they could with the limited information and records available. She suggested they could possibly come up with design standards for this area or form-based code which would help form the character of this place. The design standards would create a cohesive look for the area. She realized that it probably would not affect this project because it would take time. Ms. Larson expressed issues with changing the windows and said there was very little left of what the garage looked like, and the windows should be kept where it was now and the exterior kept as much as it looked now.</p> <p>Mr. Jung replied that they couldn't confirm if the windows were repositioned after the rebuild. Ms. Valenciano displayed the June 23, 1983, permit of the rebuild of the garage.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>10. Ms. Larson asked if the garage was rebuilt for the history center. Ms. Valenciano replied that it was rebuilt as a garage.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano said the building now was very different than what the 1983 plans indicated, and they do not have original plans or drawings of the building. Mr. Jung said the applicant was willing to address these comments to reposition the windows and change the windows to wooden casing and replace the exterior with board and batten.</p> <p>11. Ms. Larson asked that they change the three front door panels. The tongue and groove panels were horizontal, and the exterior walls had vertical board and batten. Mr. Jung replied they would change it to look more like a garage door. He displayed a picture of what HHF commented on.</p> <p>12. Mr. Ida asked where the original garage entrance was. Mr. Jung replied they speculate the front area was the original entrance due to the drive-in spots of the three bays.</p> <p>13. Ms. Larson asked if the garage was commercial or home garage. Mr. Jung replied it was a home garage but was probably also used as storage for the Yamamoto store.</p> <p>Ms. Larson stated that she supported reuse of buildings to preserve the historic nature. She said the closest visual of what they could work with was the rebuild after the hurricane.</p> <p>Ms. Summers commented that it was unfair to conform to something unknown because the building probably changed multiple times. She agreed with changes to the window since it improved the look of the structure. Mr. Ida agreed with Ms. Summers and said changing the windows would maintain the look of the area and asked that the three front panels replaced with vertical board and batten. He said the window type had a lot to do with the character of the building and blending in with the rest of the buildings. Ms. Larson stated the windows were better left where they are currently, and double hung windows are consistent in the area.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa asked the motion include the suggestions and comments.</p>	<p></p> <p>Ms. Larson moved to accept proposed design with the caveat that the design and incorporate the commissions concerns and suggestions. <i>(motion restated below)</i></p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Together the commission came up with the following comments;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use board and batten for the three front panels and place it consistent with the rest of the exterior walls 2. Use wooden casement or double hung windows, not metal but match the design of the other buildings in the area. 3. Off white color pallet 4. Disguise exhaust vent without affecting function <p>Mr. Chung asked the commission if they could consider a plantation style door instead of board and batten.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to accept the proposed design from Java Kai Old Kōloa Town, Old Kōloa Town Building Renovation, Lot 4A, Kōloa, Kaua'i, Hawai'i, TMK: (4)2-8-007:016, Renovation of an existing structure with the commission's comments and suggestions;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The three panel front doors be designed and consistent with the rest of the exterior walls 2. Windows replaced with wooden casement or double hung windows, not metal, and compatible with other windows in the area 3. Off white color pallet 4. Disguise exhaust vent without affecting function <p>Ms. Summers seconded the</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		motion. Roll Call vote: Aye-6 Nay-0. Motion carried 6:0
	<p>I.3. Discussion on Archeological Guidelines</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa asked the commission if they could provide archeological guidance for zoning, SMA (Special Management Area) projects that would be placed on the agenda for KHPRC to review for potential impacts to archaeology. She said they review hundreds of permits with potential burial sites, and it's referred to SHPD.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked that the department provide a category list and examples of what they would review.</p> <p>Chair Ida cautioned that KHPRC should not become SHPD. The commission should only act if they saw anything wrong with a SHPD report or if they could contribute more information.</p> <p>Ms. Summers suggested the commission review SHPD's electronic form to gain a better understanding.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said she would gather more information as requested and place it on the January 2022 agenda for further discussion.</p>	<p>Ms. Summers moved to defer discussion on archeological guidelines to the January 2022 meeting. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
J. Announcements	There were none.	
K. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics	<p>Next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, November 18, 2021, and no meeting in December. Mr. Guerber said he would not be available for the November 18, meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa said the next agenda would include a brief review of the commission's roles and duties.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
(November 18, 2021)		
L. Adjournment	With no further business to conduct, Chair Ida called for a motion to adjourn.	Ms. Larson moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0. Chair Ida adjourned the meeting at 4:49pm

Submitted by: _____ Reviewed and Approved by: _____
 Sandra M. Muragin, Commission Support Clerk Gerald Ida, Chair

- () Approved as circulated.
- (X) Approved with amendments. See minutes of 01/27/22 meeting.