

COUNTY OF KAUA'I
Minutes of Meeting
OPEN SESSION

Board/Commission:	Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission	Meeting Date	February 17, 2022
Location	Zoom Teleconference	Start of Meeting: 1:42 p.m.	End of Meeting: 3:28 p.m.
Present	Chair Carolyn Larson. Vice Chair Stephen Long. Commissioners: James Guerber, Gerald Ida, Susan Remoaldo and Aubrey Summers. Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall. Planning Department Staff: Deputy Director Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa, Planner Marisa Valenciano, Commission Specialist Shanlee Jimenez and Commission Support Clerk Duke Nakamatsu. Office of Boards and Commissions: Administrator Ellen Ching and Commission Support Clerk Sandra Muragin.		
Excused			
Absent			
SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
	Meeting was delayed after several attempts were made by Chair Larson to get her computer camera to work; with no success she used her smart phone.		
A. Call To Order	Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 1:42 p.m.		
B. Roll Call	Deputy Director Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa verified attendance by roll call and requested a verbal response; Commissioner Guerber replied here. Commissioner Ida replied here. Commissioner Remoaldo replied here. Commissioner Summers replied here. Vice Chair Long replied here. Chair Larson replied present.	Quorum was established with six commissioners present.	
C. Approval of the Agenda	<i>Ms. Summers dropped out of view at 1:43pm and did not vote verbally or by show of hand on the motion.</i>	Mr. Guerber moved to approve the February 17, 2022 agenda, as circulated. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:0.	
D. Approval of the Minutes	There were no minutes to approve.		

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
E. Communications	There were no communications.	
F. Public Comment	<p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa paused to allow anyone from the public to testify. Hearing none she moved to the next agenda item.</p> <p><i>Ms. Summers returned at 1:44 p.m.</i> <i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 1:45 p.m.</i></p>	
G. Consent Calendar	There were none.	
H. Unfinished Business	There was no unfinished business.	
I. New Business	<p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 1:45 p.m.</i></p> <p>I.1. Hawai'i Department of Transportation Highways Division-Kaua'i District Kūhiō Highway, Hanalei Bridge Repair Tax Map Key: (4) 5-4-004:010; (4) 5-3-001:007; (4) 5-4-004:031; (4) 5-4-003:007; and the Right-of-way of Kūhiō Highway in the vicinity of these listed TMKs. National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian a. Director's Report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 1:46 p.m.</i></p> <p>Planner Marisa Valenciano shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commission's action for the project was to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide information or knowledge of historical or cultural sites in the project area. ○ Provide comments for a response letter. ○ Defer comments until more information becomes available. • Read portions of the Director's Report dated February 17, 2022. <p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 1:47 p.m.</i> <i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 1:48 p.m.</i></p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 1:49 p.m.</i> <i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 1:49 p.m.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The department recommended the commission memorialize comments on specific information or knowledge and identify any historical or cultural sites within the project area. <p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 1:50 p.m.</i></p> <p>Eric Fujikawa Hawai'i Department of Transportation (HDOT) Highways Division and Project Manager, Kaua'i District Engineer Larry Dill along with the design consultant team; KSF Inc. Structural & Construction Engineering consultant Gary Iwamoto, and Guy Blanchard and Rachel Adams from WSP shared a power point presentation titled Hanalei River Bridge Rehabilitation Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reiterated that this project was independent and not part of last year's presentation on the traffic signal improvements in the vicinity of Hanalei bridge. Main objective for today's presentation was for maintenance and repair of the bridge. • WSP consultant Guy Blanchard shared bridge history; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hanalei bridge was constructed in 1912 and had undergone numerous repairs and rehabilitation. ○ 1978 the bridge was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. • TSP consultant Gary Iwamoto shared bridge inspection, proposed rehabilitation, and alternative to bridge closures: temporary bridge and detour; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Routine inspections uncovered corrosion and section loss, decay, and water stains. ○ Proposed rehabilitation to refurbish, rust mitigation, replace damaged sections, clean and paint to prevent corrosion. ○ To ease traffic and bridge closures they would construct a temporary bridge on the northside of the Hanalei bridge. ○ Construction of the temporary bridge concrete pads would avoid any historic areas. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Install temporary gabions on the side of Ohiki road that would be removed once work was completed. ● WSP consultant Rachel Adams shared federal requirements and section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Federal funded project and would follow all federal requirements ○ They were now on step two which involved identification and evaluation of historic properties that may be in the area. ○ Next step would evaluate the information and conduct impact analysis and coordinate with State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) to develop a mitigation plan, if needed. <p>Kaua'i District Engineer Larry Dill clarified that they have not finalized their decision on constructing a temporary Acrow bridge. He said the other alternative was to have bridge closures; which would have a significant impact on traffic.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vice Chair Long brought up the issue with numerous highway signage around the historic bridge. He said the community was also annoyed and asked Mr. Kincaid to take out signage from a level one to level three. Mr. Dill acknowledged his concerns and there would be temporary bridge signs installed but it would be removed once the project was completed. 2. Chair Larson asked if signage was part of this project. Mr. Dill responded no. They planned temporary signage to alert drivers of the bridge repairs. 3. Mr. Guerber inquired if they would consider leaving the temporary bridge and could it be built to not remove. Mr. Dill replied that would not be an option and construction of a new bridge would require a much larger effort and scope of work. 4. Chair Larson asked if he knew of any plans in the future to add an additional bridge. Mr. Dill replied there were none. 5. Chair Larson asked if once the temporary bridge was removed would that include the concrete pilings. Mr. Iwamoto replied they would remove as much of the pilings as possible. 6. Chair Larson asked if the concrete pilings would remain. Mr. Iwamoto replied some of the concrete would remain in the area below the water level. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>7. Ms. Remoaldo asked if the temporary bridge was installed would the gabions be placed in the riverbed and in a high-water event during the repairs would that affect the water spilling over into the valley. Mr. Dill responded the gabions would be used as a retaining wall to support the road and filled to raise Ohiki road and level it out with Kūhiō Highway.</p> <p>8. Ms. Remoaldo asked if anything installed for the temporary bridge would impact the river flow. Mr. Dill responded the concrete shafts to support the temporary bridge would be up the riverbank on either side.</p> <p>9. Ms. Summers stated the ring road was protected which would prohibit the installation of a second bridge. Mr. Dill acknowledged her point but it didn't mean nothing could be done. If any changes were considered it would need to go through SHPD, community, Hawai'i historic foundation and other interested parties.</p> <p>10. Ms. Remoaldo asked if solar traffic lights were appropriate since the area rained often and was shaded. Ms. Rachel responded solar traffic lights was selected because it would not require trenching; however, they would check the feasibility of using solar.</p> <p>11. Chair Larson asked if the temporary bridge would endanger the historic bridge in the event of a flood. Mr. Dill responded the historic bridge would not be adversely impacted by the temporary bridge in the event of a flood.</p> <p>12. Chair Larson asked if the temporary bridge would be built above flood level. Mr. Iwamoto responded the temporary bridge would be elevated above the height of the historic bridge.</p> <p>Chair Larson said the applicant wanted comments from the commission and asked if any were addressed that needed to be memorialized. There was no response from the commission.</p>	<p>Vice Chair Long moved to accept and approve the Hawai'i Department of Transportation Highways Division-Kaua'i District Kūhiō Highway, Hanalei Bridge Repair, Tax Map Key: (4) 5-4-004:010; (4) 5-3-001:007; (4) 5-4-004:031; (4) 5-4-003:007; and the Right-of-way of Kūhiō</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>Highway in the vicinity of these listed TMKs as presented with no comments from KHPRC. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Aye-5 (<i>Mr. Ida held up a sign "Ae" to the camera, audio was not working</i>). Nay-0 Abstain-1 (Guerber). Motion carried 5:0:1.</p>
	<p>I.2. State of Hawai'i Department of Land and Natural Resources-Division of State Parks Pā'ūla'ūla/Russian Fort Elizabeth State Historical Park Tax Map Key: (4) 1-7-005:003 Kona Moku, Makaweli Ahupua'a Consideration of proposed improvements including a viewing platform, boardwalk, and repair and maintenance projects. a. 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 for the project was to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support the project ○ Recommend approval with conditions ○ Recommend denial of permits ○ Recommend defer action on the permits • The park was split into two jurisdictions the state and county of Kaua'i. The boardwalk and viewing platform were on state jurisdiction and the repair and maintenance sections were on county of Kaua'i jurisdiction. The department requested the commission concentrate on the repair and maintenance sections that were under the jurisdiction of the county of Kaua'i. • The commission had the authority to review the project in its entirety; however, any comments on the boardwalk or viewing platform fell under the state and would be submitted to the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) who had the authority to 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>incorporate their comments or not into the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read portions of the Director’s Report dated February 17, 2022. • Property was listed on the State and National Register of Historic Places, was over 50 years old and on the KHPRC inventory list. • The department recommends support for the proposed project. <p><i>Vice Chair Long walked out of view at 2:27 p.m.</i> <i>Vice Chair Long returned at 2:28 p.m.</i> <i>Vice Chair Long walked out of view at 2:28 p.m.</i> <i>Vice Chair Long returned at 2:28 p.m.</i></p> <p>Architect Marc Ventura was the representative for the project and with him was Jessie Elliott. Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Remoaldo commented that the boardwalk and platform were made with material that allowed easy wheelchair access and complied with ADA (American with Disabilities Act). She asked if the coral pathway was ADA compliant. Mr. Ventura replied it fell within the accessibility guidelines. The board walk and platform material would be made using Trex® material and compared it to the Hā’ena state park boardwalk and transition onto a coral pathway. 2. Ms. Remoaldo asked if the coral pathway would be affected and become unsafe if it rained. <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:31 p.m.</i></p> <p>Mr. Ventura responded the coral would be compacted into the dirt and should not get muddy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Ms. Remoaldo asked what drainage problems would be addressed because the parking lot ponds water. <p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 2:33 p.m.</i> <i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:33 p.m.</i></p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Elliott responded that pending available funds they plan to resurface the parking lot and would replace a four-inch diameter drainage pipe with a concrete swale.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 2:34 p.m.</i></p> <p>4. Ms. Remoaldo stated that “intent” and “where feasible” were used implying it was not concrete.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:34 p.m.</i></p> <p>She said it was a concern to allow leeway in how the project would carry out.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 2:34 p.m.</i></p> <p>Mr. Ventura said they have a budget to complete the whole project and from a budget standpoint they may not be able to achieve everything.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:36 p.m. but audio worked, and he presented the following by audio only;</i></p> <p>Mr. Ida referenced page 13, section M. Cultural it stated that “According to the State Archaeologist, DLNR, SHPD, a inventory survey level of study will not be required for this area. Due to the intensive activities previously conducted on the property, it is unlikely that the project area contains any cultural material or archaeological sites.” He had a problem with that statement that was listed in the Russian Fort Improvements report dated December 2021. Mr. Ida said the entire area was an archaeological site. Mr. Ida asked if the coral pathways or concrete blocks to support the boardwalk would it require grading or excavation. Mr. Ventura respectfully acknowledged his concerns and would try to minimize ground disturbance.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 2:39 p.m.</i></p> <p>Mr. Ventura said the boardwalk would require footings and they would grade and excavate seven to twelve inches and for the coral pathway would be six to seven inches. Mr. Elliott replied they</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>were in contact with SHPD and take caution to minimize effects to the area. There would be state archaeologist onsite monitoring in the fort area.</p> <p><i>Chair Larson dropped out of view at 2:40 p.m.</i> <i>Mr. Guerber walked out of view at 2:41 p.m.</i> <i>Chair Larson returned at 2:42 p.m.</i></p> <p>Mr. Ida was suspicious that they would use a state archaeologist, state architect on state land. He said he was with Archaeologist Peter Mills when they examined the area and found cultural materials. He was told there may be bodies buried in the fort.</p> <p><i>Mr. Guerber returned at 2:42 p.m.</i></p> <p>Mr. Ida was doubtful that the area could be protected with SHPD's response and unsure if Mr. Ventura could be trusted since they would disturb ground in an archaeological area.</p> <p>5. Chair Larson referenced page 32, section C. Cultural, "<i>Based on the above, a determination of "no historic properties affected" has been proposed.</i>" Mr. Ida did not agree with that finding and stated it would have an adverse effect and unsure how to mitigate the problem.</p> <p>Chair Larson asked if KHPRC could recommend archaeological monitoring. Mr. Ida was suspicious that it was a state project, on state land and they would have a state archaeologist monitoring.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:44 p.m. but audio worked, and he presented the following by audio only;</i> He was adamant that there should be no ground disturbance without an archaeological monitor.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said KHPRC could request the department to draft a letter to DLNR stating their concerns and recommendations.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 2:47 p.m.</i></p> <p>6. Vice Chair Long asked Mr. Ida if he would recommend onsite archaeologist outside of the state.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view and returned at 2:48 p.m. several times.</i></p> <p>Mr. Ida responded a strong recommendation for onsite monitoring on any ground disturbance inside the fort. He was not concerned on any excavation outside the fort.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:49 p.m.</i></p> <p>Mr. Long commented that Marc Ventura was a highly respected architect on Kaua'i and would make every effort, within budget, to ensure the project was carried out correctly.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 2:50 p.m.</i> <i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:51 p.m.</i> <i>Mr. Ida returned at 2:51 p.m.</i></p> <p>Chair Larson asked if the commission had any comments on the repair and maintenance sections that were on county of Kaua'i jurisdiction. She said Ms. Remoaldo pointed out drainage in the parking lot. Mr. Ida had no concerns with the area outside the fort and the rest of the commission did not have any comments either. Chair Larson asked if an amendment to the motion could be made to include planning department staff draft a letter of their concerns to SHPD. Ms. Valenciano clarified that the department would draft a letter on behalf of KHPRC to the state DLNR and asked the commission to confirm this.</p>	<p>Mr. Long moved to accept the report on State of Hawai'i's and county of Kaua'i and highly recommend and require onsite archaeological monitoring on any ground disturbance inside the Russian Fort area. Mr. Ida seconded the motion. (<i>motion amended below</i>)</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:53 p.m.</i> <i>Mr. Ida returned at 2:53 p.m.</i></p> <p>The commission agreed and Mr. Long requested the letter state that it be required not suggested.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:54 p.m.</i> <i>Mr. Ida returned at 2:54 p.m.</i></p> <p>Ms. Valenciano confirmed with the commission that the department would draft a letter on behalf of KHPRC to the state DLNR on their required comments and there were no comments on the county of Kaua'i repair and maintenance projects.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 2:56 p.m.</i></p> <p>Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall said he summed up the request that KHPRC accepts and approves the report with the condition that there be a requirement for onsite monitoring during any ground disturbance inside the fort.</p>	<p>Mr. Long moved to accept the State and County of Kaua'i project for the State of Hawai'i's report from Marc Ventura AIA, LLC dated December 2021 titled Russian Fort Improvements Petition for: Class IV Zoning Permit dated December 2021, and the Department of Planning's Director's Report dated February 17, 2022 on the State of Hawai'i Department of Land and Natural Resources- Division of State Parks Pā'ūla'ūla/Russian Fort</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 2:56 p.m.</i></p>	<p>Elizabeth State Historical Park Tax Map Key: (4) 1-7-005:003 Kona Moku, Makaweli Ahupua'a, Consideration of proposed improvements including a viewing platform, boardwalk, and repair and maintenance projects and require onsite archaeological monitoring on any ground disturbance inside the Russian Fort area and requested the planning department draft a letter to SHPD regarding their decision and requirements. Ms. Summers seconded the motion.</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: Aye-6 Nay-0. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
	<p>I.3. L. Shimokawa-Zensai Kaua'i (formerly known as the Kaua'i Pupu Factory Building) Property Address: 1-3566 Kaumuali'i Hwy, Hanapēpē Tax Map Key: (4) 1-9-010:013 Hanapēpē, Hawai'i Consideration of a Class 1 Zoning Permit for the proposed enclosure of an existing carport area for the conversion to a retail shop.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. 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 for the project was to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support the project 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommend to the department to approve any zoning permits with conditions ○ Recommend to the department to consider denial of permits ○ Recommend to the department to defer action on the permits ● Read portions of the Director’s Report dated February 17, 2022. ● Property was fifty years old and on the KHPRC list. ● The department recommends support for the project as represented. <p>Lori Shimokawa, the owner, did not have a presentation.</p> <p><i>Vice Chair long dropped out of view at 3:03 p.m.</i></p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Ida asked what was holding the carport roof. Ms. Shimokawa replied that her contractor George Kawamura would construct a new structure around the roof. <p><i>Vice Chair long returned at 3:03 p.m.</i> <i>Vice Chair long dropped out of view at 3:04 p.m.</i></p> <p>Ms. Valenciano clarified that two metal columns kept the roof propped up.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Mr. Ida asked which part of the building was being enclosed. Ms. Valenciano replied it was the right side of the building. <p><i>Vice Chair long returned at 3:06 p.m.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Chair Larson asked when the left side was enclosed and what exterior material was used. <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 3:06 p.m.</i></p> <p>Ms. Shimokawa replied it was enclosed when pupu factory took over approximately 17 to 20 years ago.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Chair Larson asked who occupied the building prior to pupu factory. Ms. Shimokawa said 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>it was radiator shop owned by Mr. Harper.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 3:07 p.m.</i></p> <p>5. Chair Larson asked if the radiator shop enclosed the left side. Ms. Shimokawa replied yes, and pupu factory remodeled the space into a kitchen.</p> <p>6. Chair Larson asked if the middle section the concrete part of the building was original. Ms. Valenciano replied a 1994 survey mentioned the concrete section was original. There was no information about the left kitchen side so it could be a later addition.</p> <p>7. Chair Larson asked about the kitchen side exterior surface; tongue and groove (t&g) or plywood t&g. Ms. Valenciano was not sure.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 3:10 p.m.</i></p> <p>Chair Larson asked if anyone else had concerns with the use of plywood t&g in the new addition instead of using the same exterior material that was on the left side addition. No one responded.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 3:11 p.m.</i></p> <p>8. Vice Chair Long asked for the exterior surface treatment on the existing building. Ms. Valenciano replied the elevations show plywood t&g.</p> <p>9. Ms. Remoaldo said the drawings did not have a date and asked if the commercial use of the building was still valid. <i>No answer because Ms. Valenciano answered Vice Chair Long's question #8 that was delayed because she had to research the answer.</i></p> <p>Chair Larson asked if the addition should match the material and style to the original which was use real t&g or board and batten. Ms. Summers replied that additions should look like a new addition and the enclosure exterior would match the exterior of the kitchen side. Ms. Valenciano reiterated that it didn't have to replicate the original, but the owner wanted it to match the other side, the kitchen addition side.</p> <p>10. Vice Chair Long asked if the existing building was plywood t&g. Ms. Valenciano</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>replied she could not confirm but the middle part of the building was concrete, the left side addition exterior was t&g and the right-side exterior would be plywood t&g. Ms. Shimokawa commented that they would match the addition exterior to the kitchen side exterior.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida dropped out of view at 3:17 p.m.</i></p> <p>10. Ms. Remoaldo said her question wasn't answered...there was no date on the drawings and asked if the vape shop would still occupy the proposed addition. Ms. Shimokawa said the plan was to use it for a vape shop, but the shop owner was in a recent accident and now she wasn't sure.</p> <p><i>Mr. Ida returned at 3:19 p.m.</i></p> <p>Ms. Summers commented that the kitchen side looked like plywood t&g and it continued on top of the middle section below the roof.</p>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to support the L. Shimokawa-Zensai Kaua'i (formerly known as the Kaua'i Pupu Factory Building) Property Address: 1-3566 Kaumuali'i Hwy, Hanapēpē Tax Map Key: (4) 1-9-010:013 Hanapēpē, Hawai'i Consideration of a Class 1 Zoning Permit for the proposed enclosure of an existing carport area for the conversion to a retail shop. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Aye-6 Nay-0. Motion carried 6:0</p>
<p>J. General Business</p>	<p>There were none.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Matters		
K. Announcements	<p>Ms. Valenciano announced a Historic Hawai'i Foundation Zoom training on Wednesday, March 2, 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. regarding flood adaption for historic buildings. Register in advance if you plan to attend and Ms. Valenciano will email a link.</p> <p>Call main line 241-4050 for computer assistance. She said it was difficult for Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa or herself to answer a phone call in the middle of a meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa announced that the legislature planned to return to in-person meetings next month which would trigger possible in-person KHPRC meetings in April. She would keep everyone informed.</p>	
L. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics (March 17, 2022)	<p>Next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, March 17, 2022</p> <p>Agenda items;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Programmatic Agreement 2. Douglas Baldwin Beach House garage alternative 3. KHPRC rule amendments 4. HABS (Historic American Building Survey) like document 	
M. Adjournment	<p>With no further business to conduct, Chair Larson called for a motion to adjourn.</p>	<p>Mr. Ida moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p> <p>Chair Larson adjourned the meeting at 3:28pm</p>

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

- () Approved as circulated.
- (X) Approved with amendments. See minutes of 03/17/22 meeting.