

COUNTY OF KAUA'I  
Minutes of Meeting  
OPEN SESSION

Board/Commission:	<b>Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission</b>	Meeting Date	<b>November 18, 2021</b>
Location	Zoom Teleconference	Start of Meeting: 1:30 p.m.	End of Meeting: 4:37 p.m.
Present	Chair Gerald Ida. Vice Chair Susan Remoaldo. Commissioners: Carolyn Larson, Stephen Long and Aubrey Summers. Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall. Planning Department Staff: Planning Director Ka'āina Hull, 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	Commissioner James Guerber		
Absent			
SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
	Prior to the meeting being called to order, Administrative Assistant to the County Clerk Eddie Topenio administered the Oath of Office to Planning Mayoral Appointee Commissioner Stephen Long serving a second term ending 12/31/24 and History Mayoral Appointee Commissioner Carolyn Larson serving a second term ending 12/31/24.		
<b>A. Call To Order</b>	Chair Ida called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.		
<b>B. Roll Call</b>	Planning Director Ka'āina Hull verified attendance by roll call and requested a verbal response; Commissioner Guerber was excused. 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 five commissioners present.
<b>C. Approval of the Agenda</b>	Chair Ida was experiencing internet connectivity issues. While the commission waited for		Ms. Summers moved to approve the November 18, 2021 agenda, as circulated. Vice Chair Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Chair Ida to regain visual presence Mr. Hull reviewed Exhibit C that was sent to all commissioners and explained sunshine laws new procedures for virtual meetings that would officially take effect January 2022. It stated that all commissioners must be visible and audibly present during the entire meeting. If connectivity was lost the meeting would be suspended until the commissioner regained visual and audible access to the meeting.</p>	
<p><b>D. Approval of the Minutes</b></p>	<p>There were no minutes to approve.</p>	
<p><b>E. Communications</b></p>	<p>There were no communications.</p>	
<p><b>F. Public Comment</b></p>	<p>Mr. Hull announced no public testimony was received. He opened the floor for the public to testify and called out each caller;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Barbara Shidler – responded part of Hawai'i department of transportation presentation</li> <li>2. 808-222-2863 – responded just listening</li> </ol>	
<p><b>G. Consent Calendar</b></p>	<p>None.</p>	
<p><b>H. Unfinished Business</b></p>	<p><b>H.1. St. Catherine Church Parish Center        Kamehameha Schools (Applicant/Lessee)</b>        TMK: (4) 4-6-015:058        Property Address: 5021A Kawaihau Road, Kapa'a, HI</p> <p>Conversion of the former nunnery building into a preschool building. Renovations include the demolition and reconfiguration of the interior layout along with repairs to the roof, windows, and doors. Additional improvements include a new covered walkway, fenced in play yard, on-site access improvements, and a new septic system.</p> <p>a. Director's Report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commission's action was to provide comments and directions that would generate a Section 106 response letter;           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Support for the project</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Recommend to the planning commission to approve with conditions</li> <li>○ Recommend to the planning commission to deny the permits</li> <li>○ Recommend defer action on the permits</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Read portions of the Director’s Report dated November 18, 2021.</li> <li>● The project was presented to the commission on October 17, 2019, and the commission requested more information and historical documentation and photos of the nunnery, which the applicant was not able to acquire.</li> <li>● The department recommended the commission support the proposed renovations as represented.</li> </ul> <p>Rebecca Candilasa, Planning Consultant for Wilson Okamoto Corporation gave a few additional updates and introduced Joleen Miranda-Pesquira, Architect for Ushijima Architects, Inc., and Laura Takahashi of Kamehameha Schools;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Kamehameha Schools plans to close and relocate the Anahola preschool location to this area and would lease the property from the Roman Catholic Church, landowner.</li> <li>● Efforts were made to contact the Kaua’i Historic Society and landowner for documentation and photos that the commission requested that would provide more detailed information of the original nunnery building, but they were unsuccessful.</li> <li>● The landowner referred them to a long-time administrator who recalled that the CMU blocks were original and after Hurricane Iniki the roof and windows were replaced.</li> </ul> <p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ms. Larson expressed her disappointment that the applicant could not produce any historic documentation or photos and asked to describe the efforts taken. Ms. Candilasa replied they contacted the Kaua’i Historic Society and they did not have any photos of the building but found a 1958 Garden Island Newspaper special edition on the dedication of the nunnery building but there were no photos. They also reached out to the landowner, but they also did not have any historic documents or pictures of the nunnery building to share. The church went through several administrative changes and the current staff could not locate any files.</li> <li>2. Ms. Larson asked if they talked with Carmen. Ms. Miranda-Pesquira did not know who Carmen was.</li> </ol>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>3. Ms. Larson shared that she contacted the church and they referred her to Carmen Nakasone who may have information and photos of the nunnery building. Ms. Miranda-Pesqueira replied they did not speak with a Carmen but other members of the church with no success. She said records were lost after Hurricane Iniki. Ms. Takahashi replied that she also was unaware of a Carmen Nakasone but spoke with a Laura who was a longtime head administrator that moved to O'ahu.</p> <p>4. Ms. Larson asked if Laura was the principal of the school. Ms. Takahashi replied that she may have been. They also met with Father Nick and Father Anthony.</p> <p>5. Ms. Larson asked if they checked the archives from the Diocese of Honolulu, which may have information. Ms. Candilasa replied they did not.</p> <p>6. Ms. Larson asked if they contacted the congregation. Ms. Takahashi replied inquiries were concentrated with Father Nick and that option was not offered.</p> <p>Ms. Larson expressed concern that the commission was not given historic documents or photos. She said there should be something out there that could identify the original type of windows and roof material.</p> <p>7. Mr. Long commented that he supported the commissions opinion and referred to the lack of information as a feeble attempt. He asked if anyone came over to Kaua'i. Ms. Takahashi responded that they have regional directors on island and spoke with Laura several times. Mr. Long said with more effort they would be able to find more documentation.</p> <p>Mr. Hull commented that the planning department staff did a considerable amount of research, and they also were not able to track down additional documents. The result was not a feeble attempt.</p> <p>8. Ms. Larson asked if they contacted the group of nuns that inhabited the nunnery building. She thought they may be Benedictine nuns. Ms. Candilasa appreciated the information and would follow-up.</p> <p>9. Ms. Larson asked if this was the only nunnery building on Kaua'i. Ms. Candilasa didn't know but would research. Ms. Remoaldo responded Immaculate Conception and St. Catherine still had nunnery buildings that existed. <b>Holy</b> Cross and St. Theresa's nunnery buildings were</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>gone.</p> <p>Ms. Larson expressed concern that this may be the last surviving nunnery building on Kaua'i and did not want to lose the history and story. Ms. Remoaldo agreed and understood what Ms. Larson shared but felt it was also important to support the directors report that specified that prior to renovation they would document the nunnery building. She said they all contained three buildings a nunnery building, church, and school. She acknowledged that within a 40-year period these types of properties went through renovations, hurricanes, and fire.</p> <p>Ms. Larson commented that it would be great to reuse the nunnery building for a preschool; however, she was challenged with being the one to possibly destroy the original building and asked if they could leave one or two rooms untouched. Ms. Takahashi offered to display the plans and elevations to show the extent of the changes.</p> <p>Ms. Candilasa displayed Exhibit D Preliminary Design Drawings and Joleen Miranda-Pesqueira reviewed the plans;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The nunnery building was currently functioning as office space, storage, meeting rooms and a gift shop.</li> <li>• Photo of the interior dormitory rooms that contained a closet, built in shelves and sink.</li> <li>• Proposed new layout would remove the dormitory rooms and create two large classrooms, install a central restroom area, and convert the laundry room to another bathroom. Replace windows and doors and add a covered walkway.</li> <li>• Windows and roofing would be replaced with the same type and materials.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Long apologized to the planning department staff and consultants for his misunderstanding of the efforts made to retrieve historic material and photos and extended an appreciation for their efforts.</p> <p>10. Ms. Summers commented that the architect and planner have already documented what was done and asked what more needed to be documented. Vice Chair Remoaldo wanted more photographs because from the picture of the dormitory room she could not determine the size</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>of room. Ms. Larson agreed and requested they add video documentation. She reiterated her desire to keep one of the dormitory rooms preserved. Ms. Candilasa clarified with Ms. Larson that the built-in shelves and sink were important to preserve.</p> <p>11. Mr. Long asked for the dimensions of the dormitory rooms. Ms. Miranda-Pesqueira replied they were approximately 10x10. He replied that it would be interesting if they could include Ms. Larson's requests without it interfering with the overall renovation of the space.</p>	<p>Mr. Long moved to accept and approve the St. Catherine Church Parish Center Kamehameha Schools (Applicant/Lessee) TMK: (4) 4-6-015:058 Property Address: 5021A Kawaihau Road, Kapa'a, HI, Conversion of the former nunnery building into a preschool building. Renovations include the demolition and reconfiguration of the interior layout along with repairs to the roof, windows, and doors. Additional improvements include a new covered walkway, fenced in play yard, on-site access improvements, and a new septic system, with the caveat that a historic architectural survey be done to document the building, along with photos prior to renovations and as a minor mitigating factor include</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Larson requested to add to the motion to preserve one of the dormitory rooms. Ms. Summers stated she would not support the request and asked that it be in a separate motion. Mr. Long agreed with Ms. Summers.</p> <p>Ms. Valencia asked if the historic architectural survey was the same as a HABS (Historic American Building Survey) like report. Mr. Long said he didn't know the exact terminology, but it would be the same as traffic study or traffic survey, he didn't know the official name. Ms. Candilasa responded that they included a reconnaissance level survey. Ms. Larson asked that Ms. Valenciano include an explanation to define architectural survey documentation at another meeting.</p> <p>Chair Ida commented his agreement with documentation and photos were necessary and important to preserve the history and story of the nunnery building.</p> <p>Mr. Hull proceeded with a roll call vote.</p> <p>Mr. Hall interjected that The Charter of the County of Kaua'i, Article XXIII General Provisions, Section 23.02. Boards and Commissions, J. state that a majority vote from commissioner's present shall validate an action. The KHPRC required five commissioners present for quorum and a majority vote with five commissioners present; four ayes and one nay passed. Mr. Hull announced the motion passed.</p> <p>Chair Ida asked if the commission wanted to make another motion. With no response, Chair Ida moved on to the next agenda item.</p>	<p>interviews with the congregation. Ms. Summers seconded the motion.</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: Aye-4 Nay:1 (Larson)          Motion failed: 4:1</p> <p>Motion carried: 4:1</p>
	<p><b>H.2. Hawai'i Department of Transportation and Federal Highways Administration Programmatic Agreement for Minor Hawai'i Historic Bridge Projects Statewide</b></p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties.</p> <p>a. Hawai'i Historic Bridges Programmatic Agreement.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>b. An introduction to the Best Practices Manual-introduction.            c. Summary of the Activities and Tier Levels “Appendix Tier Matrix Ch. 1-6”            d. Sample Chapter for the Best practices Manual-Appendix Chapter 3 Roadway Sample.            e. Comment Sheet            f. 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"> <li>• The commission’s action was to provide on-going comments regarding a draft Programmatic Agreement (PA);               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide comments on the draft programmatic agreement and supplemental documents</li> <li>○ Defer and withhold comments until future drafts of the programmatic agreement becomes available</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The commission reviewed this agenda item in February and March 2021.</li> <li>• The department reviewed the materials and communicated with the consultants to clarify details on the treatment of sensitive bridges, how tier determinations were made and how the PA would address emergency repairs.</li> <li>• The department recommended the commission receive the report and defer recommendations to a future meeting.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Ikaika Kincaid shared a power point presentation NHP Act Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Hawai‘i Historic Bridge Minor Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commissioners would complete an excel comment sheet that would assist with resolving any conflicting comments and asked that they consolidated their responses onto one sheet.</li> <li>• Pre-final draft PA would be available June to September 2022.</li> </ul> <p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vice Chair Remoaldo asked if they could insert page numbers on the table of contents and provide a listing of acronyms and definition of bridge elements. Mr. Kincaid responded that they have a glossary of terms that would be included in the PA.</li> <li>2. Vice Chair Remoaldo referenced top of page 11, section 7 and asked for an example of an emergency. She said an emergency would require immediate quick repairs; but could they</li> </ol>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>undo the quick fix and treat the repair differently. Mr. Kincaid responded that the repairs would follow the material type concept that was listed on page 11, General Concepts for Minor Repairs.</p> <p>Vice Chair Remoaldo said emergency meant urgent which may not be the same in the PA. Mr. Kincaid said safety for the traveling public and timeliness to repairs were most important. He said if the emergency did not fall into one of the tier activities it would not qualify under the PA, which were minor projects. A major project would be if a storm wiped out an embankment and part of a bridge washed away that would not qualify under the PA. Barbara Shidler stated emergency repairs in the PA followed the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 actions under Federal law.</p> <p>3. Chair Ida asked who decided which tier and activity to follow and what would happen if a project ranged over multiple tiers. Ms. Shidler said the Hawai'i Department of Transportation project manager was responsible for determining the tier and activity in the PA. She said they were working on language that would define if a project was still in conformance with the PA or reevaluate the scope and continue under a different tier activity. Mr. Kincaid clarified that the project manager would utilize the PA and determine if it fit into the tier activity. The PA would annually report back to SHPD (State Historic Preservation Division) on how the PA was used, which activities were used and identify the bridge. Ms. Shidler replied that after the initial rollout of the PA, they would report to SHPD twice a year in March and September. But once its determined that everyone understood the PA's tier activities it would become an annual report to SHPD. Ms. Shidler said they hope the PA would increase federal funds into the state for preventative maintenance repairs and reduce regulatory processes to repair and extend the bridge life. Mr. Kincaid said they discovered that the county &amp; district areas already performed regular maintenance but did not report to SHPD. The PA would assist with following the guidelines and appropriately track and catalog repairs for each bridge. Ms. Shidler said there would also be guidance and training on best practices manual and explanation of the Secretary of Interior Standards.</p> <p>Mr. Kincaid advised the commission to thoroughly review the tiers and activities contained in the PA. He said once the PA is finalized it would streamline the 106 process and eliminate the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>requirement to consult with KHPRC. Mr. Kincaid said if they missed an activity to please add it to the excel comment sheet.</p> <p>4. Mr. Long mentioned the replacement with in-kind and pointed out a reference to rivet and bolt replacement and asked if that was possible. Mr. Kincaid replied that there was less than a handful of skilled laborers qualified to replace rivet and bolt and they would include language to ensure that repairs are done to match as closely as possible.</p> <p>Marisa confirmed the following with Mr. Kincaid and Mr. Hull;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioners would individually fill out the excel comment sheet and turn it back to the department.</li> <li>• The department would consolidate the comment sheet for the commission to review at the January 2022 meeting. Any conflicting comments would need to be resolved.</li> <li>• March 2022 turn in a unified consolidated comment sheet to Mr. Kincaid.</li> </ul>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to defer the discussion on 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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Hawai'i Historic Bridges Programmatic Agreement.</li> <li>b. An introduction to the Best Practices Manual- introduction.</li> <li>c. Summary of the Activities and Tier Levels "Appendix</li> </ol>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Hull proceeded with a roll call vote.</p>	<p>Tier Matrix Ch. 1-6”            d. Sample Chapter for the Best practices Manual-Appendix Chapter 3 Roadway Sample.            e. Comment Sheet            f. Supplemental #1 to the Director’s Report pertaining to this matter.            to the January 20, 2022, meeting. Ms. Summers seconded the motion.             Roll Call Vote: 5-Aye 0-Nay.            Motion carried 5:0.</p>
<p><b>I. New Business</b></p>	<p><b>I.1. Hawai’i Department of Transportation and Federal Highways Administration Kūhiō Highway Emergency Shoreline Mitigation, Vicinity of Wailua Beach</b>            TMK: (4) 3-9-006:012; (4) 4-1-004:001, 020 and 999; (4) 4-1-005:004, 014, 017 and 999.</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties.</p> <p>a. Director’s Report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commission’s action was to provide comments and directions that would generate a Section 106 response letter;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide comments</li> <li>○ Defer comments until more information becomes available</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Read portions of the Director’s Report dated November 18, 2022</li> </ul>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Hawai'i Department of Transportation (HDOT) Highways Division Kaua'i District Eric Fujikawa introduced project team consultants from Douglas P USA Engineer and Consor Engineers. Todd Nishioka presented the Kūhiō Highway Emergency Shoreline Mitigation Vicinity of Wailua Beach Section 106 Consultation/Presentation November 18, 2021 power point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wailua Beach area was impacted by a storm from March 8, 2021 to March 12, 2021 that caused flooding, removal of vegetation and sand.</li> <li>• HDOT selected ungrouted rock revetment to protect Kūhiō Highway and use of Acoustic Doppler Current Profilers (ADCP) to study wave currents. Wave data would determine placement of sandsavers on the beach. The sandsavers allowed breaking waves to thrust sand particles on the beach while breaking down the energy of the waves that cause beach erosion.</li> <li>• Ungrouted rock revetment also known as riprap was the placement of rock to prevent scour from eroding roadways and bridges. Its main purpose was to protect Kūhiō highway and prevent coastal erosion from extreme storm surge, wave run ups and hurricane force waves.</li> <li>• Sandsavers used breaking wave energy to thrust sand particles up the beach while breaking the energy of the wave to reduce erosion on the beach. It was designed to build back the sand, reduces erosion, and protect the roadway.</li> <li>• Sandsavers have been used worldwide successfully. HDOT partnered with the University of Hawai'i (US) to pilot this program and potentially use it in other areas in the State of Hawai'i. Installation of sandsavers would be completed by the first half of 2022.</li> <li>• Use of ADCP was also a pilot program with UH and would be placed along the ocean floor to collect wave data. The information collected would travel through an underwater cable to a land device and manually obtained. This would also be completed by the first half of 2022.</li> </ul> <p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chair Ida asked if this was the first time this technology would be used in Hawai'i. Mr. Nishioka replied this would be the first time used in the State of Hawai'i.</li> <li>2. Chair Ida asked for the results of the technology used in other areas. Mr. Nishioka replied it was successful and the conditions at Wailua Beach supported use of the sandsaver and based on that it would be a successful project.</li> <li>3. Ms. Larson asked if the placement of sandsaver blocks was temporary, and would it be taken</li> </ol>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>out once the sand built up or if successful would it get covered in sand and left in place. Mr. Kincaid responded that exact placement was still being determined but it would be positioned in an arch. He said ideally it would remain in place and be buried but if not, it would be taken out.</p> <p>4. Vice Chair Remoaldo asked if ungrouted riprap was like the large rocks placed along Kekaha beach. Mr. Long said yes.</p> <p>5. Vice Chair Remoaldo shared that the website displayed pictures of sand grabbers made of rebar that were used in 1970. Mr. Kincaid replied it was placed in Kualoa Regional Park at Kāneʻohe Bay, Oahu and it was not successful and left in place. Vice Chair Remoaldo commented that the rebars have rusted and looked dangerous. Mr. Kincaid replied that the sandsavers have gone through a new iteration and are now made of durable plastic.</p> <p>6. Vice Chair Remoaldo said a photograph showed sandsavers in a linear shape and would that make a difference. Mr. Kincaid said the sandsavers would be placed on the beach and may be formed into two or three arches along the water break and would be linked together.</p> <p>7. Vice Chair Remoaldo said the photograph showed the blocks were not connected. Mr. Kincaid replied the sandsavers would be connected to keep the accumulated sand.</p> <p><i>Chair Ida was experiencing computer problems and decided to log off and log back in hopes that it would fix the problem.</i>  <i>Chair Ida logged out at 3:41 p.m.</i>  <i>Mr. Hull announced a 10-minute recess at 3:42 p.m.</i>  <i>Chair Ida successfully logged back in at 3:44 p.m.</i>  <i>Chair Ida reconvened the meeting at 3:52 p.m.</i></p> <p>8. Ms. Larson asked if they would replace the rock wall and would it be positioned more towards the beach. Mr. Kincaid replied that the revetment would abut the bike path.</p> <p>9. Ms. Larson asked if the rock wall would be placed more makai. Mr. Kincaid said there was no rock wall; big boulders were placed along a section of the beach.</p> <p>10. Ms. Larson asked if the proposed treatment included bringing in sand. Mr. Kincaid replied no sand would be brought in. There may be larger piles of sand in one section that would need to be pushed around to other areas.</p> <p>11. Vice Chair Remoaldo asked if the sandsavers were used in similar tropical island settings.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Kincaid replied Kaua'i would be the first one of this type of installation.</p> <p>12. Vice Chair Remoaldo asked if previous mitigations contributed to the current situation or was it caused by the storm. Mr. Kincaid replied that the area went through sand degradation many times, but it had never receded this far back, and the storm and flooding contributed.</p> <p>13. Chair Ida asked where the sandsavers would be placed on the beach. Mr. Kincaid replied ideally it would be placed at low tide level and be underwater at high tide.</p> <p>14. Chair Ida asked if the sandsavers would affect the surf spot in the bay. Mr. Kincaid replied that the surf spots were affected by the sand movement.</p> <p>At this point Ms. Larson inquired about subjects that did not pertain to the agenda and Mr. Hall and Mr. Hull asked that the questions return to the agenda.</p> <p>15. Chair Ida asked if this project was an emergency and was climate change part of the cause. Mr. Kincaid replied that sea level rise and storm and hurricane events were the cause.</p> <p>Mr. Hull paused the meeting and announced a 4:06 p.m. a public person "Kaahi Isodas" had the electronic hand raised and may want to testify. The public person removed the electronic hand.</p> <p>16. Ms. Larson asked the commission if there were concerns with the adjacent historic resources. Chair Ida replied he had no concerns. He said the area was very dynamic and had seen photographs when there was no beach in the 1940's and 1950's. With multiple sand movements over the years there was no significant archaeological items on that strip of beach left. Mr. Long agreed with Chair Ida. Mr. Long shared that that Iceland was in the process of surrounding their island with walls as high as twenty feet.</p> <p>17. Ms. Larson asked if the project would return to KHPRC. Mr. Fujikawa replied that they were seeking comments and would submit a determination letter to SHPD for concurrence and acceptance.</p> <p>Mr. Long commented that they were looking for a definitive answer and would not require return if there were no changes.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to defer until further information progress on project no other additional comments at the</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>time. Ms. Summers seconded the motion.  <i>(Motion restated below)</i></p> <p>Ms. Larson moved that KHPRC had no comments for the Hawai'i Department of Transportation and Federal Highways Administration Kūhiō Highway Emergency Shoreline Mitigation, Vicinity of Wailua Beach, TMK: (4) 3-9-006:012; (4) 4-1-004:001, 020 and 999; (4) 4-1-005:004, 014, 017 and 999, Section 106 process and requested the applicant return if there were any future substantial changes from what was proposed. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Roll Call vote 5-Ayes, 0-Nays Motion carried 5:0</p>
<p><b>J. General Business Matters</b></p>	<p><b>J. Briefing on Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission Powers and Duties</b></p> <p>Mr. Hull explained KHPRC powers and duties were founded in a 1980 historic preservation ordinance 8-14.3. Prior to 1980 the community wanted the county to become a Certified Local Government (CLG). Kaua'i has been a CLG for almost 40 years and may have been the first in the State of Hawai'i. He displayed the ordinance and Kaua'i County code section 8-14.3 Powers and Duties of the HPR Commission and read it aloud for the commissioners. With no questions from the commission, Mr. Hull moved on to the next agenda item.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>K. Announcements</b>	No December meeting.	
<b>L. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics (January 20, 2022)</b>	<p>Next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, January 20, 2022</p> <p>Election of officers would be on the agenda.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano would email out the comment sheet for the commissioners to complete and it would be placed on the agenda for the commission to discuss and review.</p> <p>Mr. Long asked about the Permitted Interaction Group Historic Inventory, if it could be restarted next year January, February, or March.</p> <p>Vice Chair Remoaldo appreciated receiving all or part of the meeting materials early.</p>	
<b>L. Adjournment</b>	With no further business to conduct, Chair Ida called for a motion to adjourn.	<p>Vice Chair Remoaldo moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Larson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.</p> <p>Chair Ida adjourned the meeting at 4:37pm</p>

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

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

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