

COUNTY OF KAUA'I  
Minutes of Meeting  
OPEN SESSION

Board/Commission:		<b>Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission</b>	Meeting Date	<b>February 15, 2024</b>
Location	Mo'ikeha Meeting Room 2A/2B		Start of Meeting: 1:02 p.m.	End of Meeting: 3:00 p.m.
Present	Chair Susan Remoaldo. Vice Chair Lee Gately. Commissioners: Gerald Ida, Carolyn Larson, Sandra Quinsaas, and Aubrey Summers. Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall. Planning Department Staff: Director Ka'aina S. Hull, Deputy Director Jodi A. Higuchi Sayegusa, Planner Marisa Valenciano, Secretary Duke Nakamatsu, and Program Manager Myles Hironaka. Office of Boards and Commissions: Commission Support Clerk Sandra Muragin.			
Excused	Commissioner Kathleen Kikuchi-Samonte, Commissioner Victoria Wichman, Office of Boards and Commissions Administrator Ellen Ching.			
Absent				
SUBJECT	DISCUSSION			ACTION
<b>A. Call To Order</b>	Chair Remoaldo called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.			
<b>B. Roll Call</b>	Deputy Director Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa verified attendance by roll call; Commissioner Ida replied here. Commissioner Kikuchi-Samonte was excused. Commissioner Larson replied here. Commissioner Quinsaas replied here. Commissioner Summers replied here. Commissioner Wichman was excused. Vice Chair Gately replied here. Chair Remoaldo replied here.			Quorum was established with six commissioners present.
<b>C. Approval of the Agenda</b>	Chair Remoaldo requested to amend the agenda and move G. Unfinished Business 1. Alexander Baldwin Removal of McBryde Sugar Company Camp 9 (Numila Plantation Camp) to after E. General Business 1. Refresher on Duties and Roles of the Commission; Parliamentary Procedures.			Vice Chair Gately moved to approve the February 15, 2024, agenda as amended. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.
<b>D. Approval of the Minute(s) of</b>	1. January 18, 2024			

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>the KHPRC</b></p>	<p>Chair Remoaldo requested page 8, number 9 change “wash house” to “washhouse”; page 9, number 14 change “single windows” to “single hung windows”; page 11 number 1 change “was” to “were.”</p> <p>Ms. Larson requested page 4, last paragraph change “construction everyone” to “construction and everyone”; page 5, first paragraph change “geography” to “geographical”; page 6, third paragraph change “second option” to second best option”; page 6, third paragraph change “third option” to third best option”;</p>	<p>Vice Chair Gately moved to approve the January 18, 2024, minutes with the following amendments; page 4, last paragraph change “construction everyone” to “construction and everyone”; page 5, first paragraph change “geography” to “geographical”; page 6, third paragraph change “second option” to second best option”; page 6, third paragraph change “third option” to third best option”; page 8, number 9 change “wash house” to “washhouse”; page 9, number 14 change “single windows” to “single hung windows”; page 11 number 1 change “was” to “were”. Ms. Summers seconded the motion.          Motion carried 6:0.</p>
<p><b>E. General Business</b></p>	<p><b>1. Refresher on Duties and Roles of the Commission; Parliamentary Procedures.</b></p> <p>Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall shared a PowerPoint presentation to provide the commission a refresher on why they met, what their duties were and parameters of their work. He looked back at the start of historic preservation which resulted in the 1966 Preservation Act. The goal of the preservation act was to get cooperation between the Federal Government, State Government, Local Government and Native Hawaiian Organizations with the task to preserve history and cultural markers, areas, and places. This commission reviews Federal Government projects triggered by Section 106, State Government projects triggered by HRS (Hawai'i Revised Statutes) 6E, County level projects defined under ordinance and zoning ordinance and Rules</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Practice and Procedures of the County Historic Preservation Review Commission. The duty of this commission was to advise and provide feedback.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Gately asked if there was one area that preserved official historical assets and documents. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa replied there was the State's archives and University of Hawai'i library.</li> <li>2. Mr. Gately asked if there was one on Kaua'i. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa replied there was the Kaua'i Historical Society. She said Marisa and herself were looking into establishing a website for future projects that could be maintained by the State's archives.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>G. Unfinished Business</b></p>	<p><b>G.1. Alexander &amp; Baldwin            Removal of McBryde Sugar Company Camp 9 (Numila Plantation Camp)</b>            Tax Map Key: (4) 2-2-001:001            'Ele'ele, Hawai'i</p> <p>Consideration of a zoning permit for the proposed demolition and the proposed relocation of existing dwellings and existing accessory structures located within the former McBryde Sugar Company Camp 9 (Numila Camp).</p> <p>Director's Report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa asked if anyone in the audience wanted to testify on this agenda item or any previous agenda item, no response.</p> <p>Planner Marisa Valenciano highlighted areas of the Director's Report dated February 15, 2024; For the record Ms. Valenciano disclosed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant provided and corrected some of the points and details that were not included in the initial report.</li> <li>• The number of homes for demolition and relocation listed in the report were based on an initial assessment and subject to change.</li> <li>• The report was looked at from a spatial analysis and evolution of the camp and not to replicate Sean O'Keefe's documentation but provide the commission a summary and</li> </ul>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>independent analysis.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano disclosed that earlier this week the department discussed the project with SHPD's (State Historic Preservation Division) architecture and archaeological branch and shared the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The architectural branch conducted an informal review of the agenda packets and director's report and agreed with the documents provided by the applicant and the departments recommended mitigation.</li> <li>• The architectural branch requested the applicant package the existing materials submitted for the agenda packet along with any other materials the applicant would submit for mitigation for a historic context study and submit a copy for the SHPD library.</li> <li>• SHPD requested SIHP (State Inventory of Historic Places) numbers be added as a condition to the zoning permits and each relocated structure would have their own number.</li> <li>• The archaeological branch would review grading permits but because the applicant would only remove structures SHPD may not have an opportunity to review when the applicant applies for the demolition permits.</li> <li>• Outlined the following permits that may trigger SHPD review: Demolition permits for the structures, Relocation permits for the structures to be relocated, Grading permit for the ground work.</li> </ul> <p>The commission's action for the project was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the project as represented.</li> <li>• A recommendation that its approval of the project should incorporate conditions of approval.</li> <li>• A recommendation to consider denial of the permits.</li> <li>• A recommendation to defer action on the permits.</li> </ul> <p>The department recommended KHPRC support the proposed project with conditions on the demolition and relocation listed in the Director's Report.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Secretary Duke Nakamatsu passed out a 22-page document containing colored photos of the exterior and interior of each structure.</p> <p>Director of Environmental Affairs Sean O'Keefe of Alexander and Baldwin, Inc. (A&amp;B) and John Gibb of Your Way Homes (YWH) came forward to answer any questions.</p> <p>John Gibb of Your Way Homes said although the structures' exteriors may look salvageable, they discovered structural integrity issues once they entered the structures and most of the damage was caused by water.</p> <p><u>Questions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ms. Larson asked if some of the homes could survive if they were repaired in place versus relocating them to another area. Mr. Gibb replied that he could not speculate if that would work or not.</li> <li>2. Ms. Summers said during her site visit she noticed water damaged the Canec ceiling which contained asbestos. Mr. O'Keefe jumped in and corrected her saying it contained arsenic not asbestos. She explained that at first glance a structure may look stable, but water damage issues may not be able to be resolved.</li> </ol> <p>Mr. O'Keefe stated in response to a request made at a prior meeting to explain how they determined which homes to be demolished would be documented with HABS (Historic American Buildings Survey) like photography and floor and elevation plans he prepared a one-page document Exhibit L-Proposed House Plans to be Prepared for Numila Camp dated January 31, 2024. The document disclosed which homes were selected and why they were selected. He also prepared a 39-page Exhibit M-Numila Camp-Submittal to Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission that contained historic documents which showed the outline of the building and some construction details.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Chair Remoaldo stated she hoped some of the out structures would be documented before demolition in particular house #17 and #18. Mr. O'Keefe replied he had them noted to be included in the documentation along with a washhouse and garage.</li> <li>4. Mr. Gately asked once the homes are relocated what's the vision to add that these homes</li> </ol>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>were part of a community called Numila. Mr. Gibb replied Old Kōloa Town would be the best match for these homes.</p> <p>5. Mr. Gately remembered at a previous meeting they were given a map that showed the location of where the homes would be placed and asked if it was near the Kōloa Neighborhood Center. Mr. Gibb replied yes, there were four vacant lots.</p> <p>Ms. Larson thanked the applicant for providing great documentation. She reiterated the most historic value was to keep the remaining structures in place, which was against the proposal presented before KHPRC. She read the following notes from her phone, “The historic resources that are in the area, by that I mean not just what was being proposed of the Numila camp but the other resources that are outside of that area that are still historic resources of Numila. It’s not only important to the history and sense of place of Kaua’i’s west side and to the state but its also an asset for continuing that sense of place into future development on Kaua’i. It’s my opinion that we should ask instead that BBCP and A&amp;B McBryde preserve historic resources in place or associate them together close to the site adapting them for reuse and that they leverage the historic value into part of the development scheme that honors Kaua’i’s history and people. And I think that we should ask BBCP to allow KHPRC and the planning department to work with them to achieve these goals of historic preservation and adaptive reuse in an economic viable way.”</p> <p>6. Ms. Summers responded and said she valued Ms. Larson’s comments and it’s a great idea; however, who would step up and purchase the land from BBCP and then spend millions to fix these structures that in her experience many could not be saved. The reality of bringing these structures up to the current code was not viable or economically feasible.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated the director’s report was done for the commission to provide a recommendation that they could use and implement in the planning department’s capacity when permits are issued. She said the commission had an opportunity to incorporate mitigation conditions with the demolition permit which be the first step in the process. The grading permit and zoning permit processes would follow. The demolition permit would deal with the proposed demolition of structures and relocation of structures. She said the commission was free to advise any other actions to further historic preservation which could include communicating with the new owners to consider relocating some of the structures on site.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>7. Mr. Gately asked Ms. Larson if the new owners were to leave and maintain the structures on-site if she envisioned that it would turn into new residences. Ms. Larson replied yes, adaptive reuse not necessarily new residences.</p> <p>Ms. Larson responded to Ms. Summers comments and stated she appreciated her expertise. She said that as commissioners they should be looking at the historic value and their role was to protect historical resources. Ms. Summers replied that she sees her role as a commissioner to protect resources within reason.</p> <p>Ms. Larson provided an interim motion for further discussion. The motion failed for a lack of a second.</p> <p>Mr. Gately asked Ms. Summers to clarify her motion as the Director's Report contained three (3) scenarios. Mr. Gately asked Ms. Summers if her motion fit into one of those scenarios. Ms. Summers responded that there is a level of commutation of what is desired in the report. She further noted that number 1 might be the most desired. If that cannot be accomplished then number 2 would be the second priority, followed by number 3. Ms. Summers clarified that the County would first try to preserve the area and structure in-place. If that could not be accomplished, then they would follow the second recommendation.</p> <p>Ms. Summers asked Ms. Valenciano to clarify what the Director's Report was recommending. Ms. Valenciano stated that the Director's Report was meant to be interpreted as a flowchart in which number 1 would be the priority route to take, however, if it was deemed infeasible, then the Department would move towards number 2, and so on. Ms. Valenciano stated that the Director's Report is structured where the Department recognizes that there could be various different scenarios dependent on what is feasible or not as the project proceeds.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately stated that he interpreted the priority preferences as guidelines of what he might choose. Preserving in-place would be a choice. He further stated that he has personally walked that property and no longer sees a neighborhood even if the area were cleaned up and made habitable. He no longer sees a plantation community with what remains. Vice Chair</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to accept the plans as submitted subject to the following conditions;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to any action on historic resources KHPRC request BBCP and A&amp;B/McBryde to reconsider demotion and removal of historic resources from the site because of significance of the resources integrally tied to the actual location of its history, as the proposed removal of the houses destroys the greatest part of their significance as historic resources.</li> <li>2. That HABS documentation be done on the three extent dwelling styles represented including the varying details in the extent modifications or deviations from those three central designs that in addition to documentation of the residences as stated all types of out buildings and structures of any kind also be documented to show the way residents used</li> </ol>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Gately further stated that he does not see preserving this area in-place as significantly as important as he might dream it to be. He does not see a nice tight-knit plantation community anymore as there is no plantation to work at, no out houses to utilize, etc. The new community would be completely different and new. Based on his interpretation, he felt that following scenario 3 and putting everyone in a different home with preserving the historical story of the area may be more meaningful at this time. The only thing he feels is left is the historical story of the area and the structures. Vice Chair Gately pointed to the Waimea Plantation Cottages as a source of inspiration for this area and its structures. Vice Chair Gately stated that he is a supporter of history and preserving the story of the area, but also can see the practical side of the project as well.</p> <p>Mr. Gibb stated that he also sees this project as a continuation of history and in preserving the history as this moment is just a point in the history of this area. He again pointed to preserving an old car and how it takes a lot of work to get the car back into a place where it can run and be operable, but once you do so, it is much easier to maintain it and keep its history intact. He related the car story to these structures and the area in that until the homes are rebuilt and brought back to life, the history of the area remains dormant under dilapidated and unlivable structures. He feels that there is a way to preserve the history even through demolition and rebuilding by keeping the story alive through the rebuilding process and by bringing the structures and areas back to life. Mr. Gibb stated that there may be options by placing QR codes or plaques in front of the buildings to commemorate the history.</p> <p>Ms. Larson stated that she disagrees with the assessment that the history is best preserved by moving the structures off of the site. She further stated that especially in Hawai'i, place is important and that buildings could and should live where they have always lived. A community could be revived in that same place. Form Based Code would allow the infill of what is there with structures similar to what was there, to keep the neighborhood features in-place. She stated that this area is where Numila was. The people who lived in those buildings were the families of the area. Once buildings are moved, though you can attach the stories to it, you have still removed a large part of the significance of it. It was significant that those buildings were there in that exact spot. The mill was near there and that is where that community was. She felt that it was worthwhile as a Commission to try the first option of keeping everything or as much as</p>	<p>their land plots for living the plantation life (i.e., garages, animal coops, shops, storage, greenhouses, out houses, etc.).</p> <p>Motion failed for the lack of a second.</p> <p>Ms. Summers moved to support the proposed recommendation and mitigating comments that are contained in the Director's Report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ida.</p>



SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>possible in-place to make it work. She feels a lot of the history will be lost if the buildings are moved. Ms. Larson stated that if the buildings were there, several of the buildings could be repurposed with one serving as a museum. Ms. Larson stated that she supports a motion to leave the structures in-place.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo stated that she is torn as far as her decision. She understands Ms. Larson's position, but also understands where Vice Chair Gately is saying as well. Chair Remoaldo stated that some buildings were already removed from Numila already. All of the removed buildings could possibly be relocated to an area in Kōloa where various eras could be memorialized in a tiny collection of historical structures. Chair Remoaldo also appreciated Ms. Larson's sentiments that the Department should go through the priorities from 1 to 3 and hoping that everyone can come to an agreement and understanding. Chair Remoaldo does not want Numila to become just a place name like Mānā and Wahiawa. As there are still people in Numila, she sees that area as more than just a place.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately expressed his appreciation to Ms. Larson and Chair Remoaldo for their wisdom on this issue. Vice Chair Gately asked the Department with the proposals as written, referring to items 1, 2, and 3, if the new landowner had any obligation to consider building homes between the historic homes. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that with the new Form Based Code for the Numila Plantation Camp, the concept that Vice Chair Gately is outlining is something that the Department has been working on. She noted that right now, the details are being worked on and is very preliminary. In summary, the idea is that for any new proposed development at Numila Camp will be compliant with a Code which prescribes design standards that mimics, echoes, or is based on the building codes that are existing today in regard to roof type, materials, siding, windows, scaling, floor plans, etc. in an effort to preserve the form and character of the area.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately stated that he agreed that it would be a shame if the structures were removed only to be replaced by a new residential project that ultimately could have housed the nineteen remaining properties that remain on-site in some way though as he understands the situation before the Commission today were not in that favor.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Larson stated that it is compelling that if things were kept in-place more of the buildings could be saved. She also stated that as a part of the process, buildings were identified that could safely be moved and if buildings were kept in-place felt that more of the buildings could be saved. Ms. Larson noted that she understands that there are others who may disagree with her and that the ultimate decision may come down to money and how much the restoration or saving of buildings costs.</p> <p>Mr. Ida stated that he does not disagree with Ms. Larson and asked the applicants if they would be amenable to having a museum within their residential development. Mr. O'Keefe stated that he does want to speak on behalf of BBCP. What he does know is that they bought the property from A&amp;B and it was an explicit condition of the sale that A&amp;B remove the Camp at A&amp;B's cost. Mr. O'Keefe did not think there was any ambiguity with what BBCP's intent was at the time of the purchase. They did not want the Camp there and they did not want to preserve the Camp. As he stated in previous meetings, it was also not A&amp;B's intention to preserve the Camp if they did not sell the land. Since the 1950s when McBryde started nudging its employees into private homeownership, the plan was also to disband Numila Camp. Mr. O'Keefe stated that in his 30-years with A&amp;B, tearing down of Numila Camp has also been on his to-do list. A&amp;B has no intention of being a part of preserving Numila Camp on land that it no longer owns and deferred any response from BBCP to BBCP's representative at the appropriate time. Mr. Ida stated that he feels that unless an outside group is going to purchase the property from BBCP, the Commission cannot do anything about what is done other than to recommend historic preservation as much as possible. Mr. Ida wanted to be realistic about what the Commission wants versus what the landowner is willing to do. He stated that there is no way the landowner is going to do what some commissioners were wanting to happen.</p> <p>Ms. Larson stated that though she understands what Mr. Ida was saying, she feels it is the Commission's role is to try to preserve the history of Kaua'i. Ms. Larson further stated that she felt no one had actually asked the landowner to try to preserve some of the structures and history of Numila Camp. She felt that if not the KHPRC, then was not sure who else on the island would do so. She further stated that there is nothing wrong with trying option 1, as options 2 and 3 would protect the historic preservation regardless. Going through the different scenarios is a win-win-win for the island. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that the motion currently on the floor is</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>to adopt the recommendations contained within the Director's Report as-is though the intention of the Department was to present a menu of options, and that the Department would need additional guidance on which option(s) were being prioritized. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that going with priority preference 1 and furthermore asking was not a recommendation made within the Director's Report. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that if Ms. Larson was set on her route of addressing this project, then an amended motion or amended Report would be needed.</p> <p>Mr. Gately asked if the new landowner was part of the application that was before the Commission. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that the new landowner was not part of the application. Mr. O'Keefe stated that the new landowner's only role is to authorize another party to obtain the necessary permits to move forward with their project. That authorization has already occurred.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked if the current motion could be amended to start with number 1, if that is unsuccessful move to number 2, etc. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that what Ms. Larson was stating could be done, but that the current motion does not include that directive. The current motion was to adopt the recommendations as-is. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa noted that the motion and the second could also be withdrawn.</p> <p>Mr. Hall recommended that the motion be withdrawn if amendments to the current motion were warranted as it would be a cleaner process for the record.</p> <p>Mr. Ida stated that through his years serving on the Commission he felt the role of the Commission was to review proposals from the applicant and comment on those proposals. He did not feel it was the Commission's role to negotiate the terms of every agreement or application that is brought forward. He felt that adding conditions such as requesting a museum or requesting a residential development with plantation homes is not a part of the proposal that was being presented to the Commission at this meeting. Furthermore, he felt that the Commission should not be asking private entities to do things like that. He reminded his colleagues that an advisory Commission like KHPRC should not be negotiating requirements of applicants.</p> <p>Mr. Hall stated that as Planning Director Hull had presented in the past, the job of the KHPRC is</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>to offer suggestions to the Planning Commission for their consideration when evaluating the applications received at that level. The KHPRC does not have the ability to require conditions to applicants. The KHPRC can only make suggestions. Mr. Hall also noted that there is a spectrum of how people interpret the making of suggestions, but that the KHPRC should also consider the issue of practicality and the likelihood of the Planning Commission taking the recommendations made by the KHPRC and making it a condition of the actual permit process. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa clarified that at the current level, it would be the Department making the recommendations to the Planning Commission after consultation with the KHPRC.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo asked Ms. Summers if she wanted to withdraw the motion that she put on the floor. Ms. Summers stated that she understood, based on Ms. Valenciano's response that the priorities were laid out in the report as priority preferences 1, 2, and 3, and would be acted on in that order of preference. Ms. Valenciano clarified that after further consideration, the Commission could treat the priority preference as Ms. Summers described, but the Commission could also decide to treat each in an ala carte fashion as well. Ms. Valenciano also reminded the Commission that the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) also provided comments and asked that their comments be included as a part of the motion or be discussed further at some point during this agenda item.</p>	<p>Ms. Summers withdrew her motion.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately moved to accept the Alexander &amp; Baldwin Removal of McBryde Sugar Company Camp 9 (Numila Planation Camp) Tax Map Key: (4) 2-2-001:001 'Ele'ele, Hawai'i and request the applicant follow the historical components from #3 Relocation of Structures in Different Locations. Following the historical components include preserving the history through the Kaua'i Historical Society, request preservation of the stories of the area, and request they provide historical connections to those properties when they are relocated. Ms. Quinsaat seconded the motion.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		Roll Call Vote: Mr. Ida – Aye Ms. Larson – Nay Ms. Quinsaat – Aye Ms. Summers – Aye Vice Chair Gately – Aye Chair Remoaldo – Aye Motion carried 5:1
<b>E. General Business</b>	<b>2. Proposal for Future Historical Markers Project.</b>	
<b>F. Communications</b>	No communications.	
<b>H. Executive Session</b>	<p><i>The commission did not need to enter executive session for H.1., H.2., and H.3.</i></p> <p><b>H.1. Refresher on Duties and Roles of the Commission; Parliamentary Procedures.</b></p> <p><b>H.2. Proposal for Future Historical Markers Project.</b></p>	
	<p><b>H.3. Alexander &amp; Baldwin            Removal of McBryde Sugar Company Camp 9 (Numila Planation Camp)</b>            Tax Map Key: (4) 2-5-001:001            ‘Ele‘ele, Hawaii</p> <p>Consideration of a zoning permit for the proposed demolition and the proposed relocation of existing dwellings and existing accessory structures located within the former McBryde Sugar Company Camp 9 (Numila Camp).</p> <p>a. Director’s Report pertaining to this matter.</p>	
<b>I. Announcements</b>	<p>Ms. Valenciano asked the commission if they would be open to changing the meeting time from 1:30 p.m. to 1:00 p.m. All commissioners agreed and the new meeting start time of 1:00 p.m. would be effective February 15.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano announced there was a list of grant opportunities.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>J. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics</b>	<p>Next meeting was scheduled for 1:00 p.m. Thursday, March 21, 2024.</p> <p>The staff would be reaching out to the commissioners to schedule the Numila camp site visits.</p> <p>Commissioners were advised to contact Ms. Valenciano or Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa if they wanted an item placed on the agenda; however, the chair would review and approve the recommended agenda item before its finalized.</p>	
<b>K. Adjournment</b>	<p>With no further business to conduct, Chair Remoaldo called for a motion to adjourn.</p>	<p>Mr. Ida moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 8:0.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo adjourned the meeting at 3:34 p.m.</p>

Submitted by: Arleen L. Kuwamura  
 Sandra M. Muragin, Commission Support Clerk

Reviewed and Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Susan Remoaldo, Chair

- ( ) Approved as circulated.
- (X) Approved with amendments. See minutes of 09/19/204 meeting.