

COUNTY OF KAUA'I
Minutes of Meeting
OPEN SESSION

Board/Commission:	Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission	Meeting Date	March 21, 2024
Location	Mo'ikeha Meeting Room 2A/2B	Start of Meeting: 1:00 p.m.	End of Meeting: 1:59 p.m.
Present	<p>Chair Susan Remoaldo. Vice Chair Lee Gately. Commissioners: Gerald Ida, Kathleen Kukuchi-Samonte (<i>in at 1:05 p.m.</i>), Carolyn Larson, Sandra Quinsaas, and Aubrey Summers.</p> <p>Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall. Planning Department Staff: Director Ka'āina S. Hull, Planner Marisa Valenciano, Secretary Duke Nakamatsu, and Planner Myles Hiranaka. Office of Boards and Commissions: Boards and Commissions Administrator Ellen Ching and Commission Support Clerk Arleen Kuwamura.</p>		
Excused	Commissioner Victoria Wichman		
Absent			
SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
A. Call to Order	Chair Remoaldo called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.		
B. Roll Call	<p>Planning Director Ka'āina S. Hull verified attendance by roll call;</p> <p>Commissioner Ida replied here.</p> <p>Commissioner Larson replied here.</p> <p>Commissioner Quinsaas replied here.</p> <p>Commissioner Summers replied here.</p> <p>Commissioner Wichman was excused.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately replied here.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo replied here.</p>	Quorum was established with six commissioners present.	
C. Approval of the Agenda	Chair Remoaldo requested to amend the agenda to move item E. General Business to the position of H. New Business and move item H. New Business to the position of E. General Business.	Vice Chair Gately moved to amend the agenda to move item E. General Business to the position of H. New Business and H. New Business to the position of E. General Business. The motion was seconded by	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		Ms. Larson. Motion carried 6:0.
D. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting(s) of the KHPRC	The Commission had no minutes to approve.	
	There being no objections, item H. New Business was taken pursuant to the amended agenda.	
H. New Business	<p>1. <u>County of Kaua'i Housing Agency</u> <u>Uahi Ridge Affordable Rental Housing Project-Phase 2</u> <u>Tax Map Key: (4) 3-8-005:022:0003</u> <u>Lihu'e, Hawai'i</u></p> <p><u>National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties.</u></p> <p>a. <u>Director's Report pertaining to this matter.</u></p> <p>Director Hull stated that there was no one signed up to testify on this matter and asked if there was anyone present who wanted to testify. There being no one present to testify, the meeting proceeded.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano explained to the Commission that before them is a Section 106 consultation process which was triggered by the use of Federal funds. She noted that the previous owner of the property received Planning Commission approval of the project back in 2009. The property was going to be used for a 220-unit condominium project. At the time of review, comments were received from SHPD and KHPRC relating mostly to the proposed demolishing of three residential structures that were over fifty years old. Since then, the property was sold to new owners who were present to respond to any comments related to the Section 106 process. Ms. Valenciano further explained that in the Director's Report are comments from the Department on the aerial potential effect (APE) boundary, the identification of historic properties in the APE and</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>the surrounding area, and suggestions on potential mitigation commitments to address the effect on the historic property.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano also provided additional findings which included the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. She looked at historical area images. There were three dwelling units prior to 2018. Two of those three structures were demolished and currently there exists only one dwelling unit on the subject property. 2. The Department went on a site visit with the Housing Agency, and it was confirmed that there is only one existing dwelling unit on the property. 3. The existing tented structure which was photographed and included in the Director's Report is situated on top of an existing driveway that was once the location of one of the dwelling units that was demolished. Given that, the Department could account for at least two of the dwelling units having existed. The Department believes that the third dwelling unit could have been on CPR Unit 2 which was a previous application that the Department looked at and reviewed in November of 2023. 4. As a part of the Building Permit process and Section 106 process, the Housing Agency and the property owner should work with the State Historic Preservation Division to determine if the existing structure has any historic significance and if there are any follow-up requirements regarding the proposed effect on the historic property, which is the demolition of the structure. <p><i>Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte was noted as present at 1:05 p.m.</i></p> <p>Given the above findings, the Planning Department recommended that the KHPRC provide comments relating to the Section 106 process, pertaining to the area of potential effect boundary, the identification of historic properties, and the effect that the proposed property would have on this historic property. The County's Housing Agency and developers were present to answer any questions from the KHPRC.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked if the three units discussed included the Manager's House and the workers' houses. Ms. Valenciano responded that the Līhu'e Plantation Manager's House is on the same lot</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>of record, but it is actually CPR Unit 1, which is not a part of the Uahi Ridge Project. In conversations with the Housing Agency, the Manager's House would not be affected by this project.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked if back when the first project came in for 300+ units, did the KHPRC look at the Manager's House and the workers' houses as a unit. Ms. Valenciano responded that she was unsure, as she was not working for the County at that time. She further stated that in the KHPRC letter that was issued in 2009 in review of that Class IV Zoning Permit, the KHPRC asked if the three residential structures present were associated with the Lihu'e Plantation Manager's House, and in the end, they were unable to make that determination. The KHRPC looked to SHPD to look into that further to see if any additional was available. The KHPRC did know that those structures may have been associated, but they were not quite sure. Ms. Valenciano confirmed for Ms. Larson that discussion centered around three residential structures and whether those three residential structures were associated with the Lihu'e Plantation Manager's House or not, and if those structures were historically significant. In the end, it appears that the KHPRC had hoped that SHPD would comment on that situation.</p> <p>Ms. Larson stated that she called a contact who lived in one of those structures to inquire with them about the association between all of the structures noted in the reports and the Manager's House to see if they have an answer to that question.</p> <p>The Commission heard from Adam P. Roversi, Housing Director for the County of Kaua'i. Mr. Roversi stated that the County's Housing Agency is technically not the applicant, as they only have a delegated authority from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Mr. Roversi stated that the Housing Agency considers this 100+ affordable housing development project in the Lihu'e Town Core area critically important for the community. Mr. Roversi stressed the importance of moving projects like this along the approval process to get much needed affordable housing to the people.</p> <p>The Commission heard from Alicia Ruelke, Developer's Representative from Ikenakea Development, LLC who was present to answer questions from the Commission.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>Patti Tancayo, Ikenakea Development, LLC was also present, but did not speak.</i></p> <p>Ms. Larson asked Ms. Ruelke what plans the developer has to protect the historic resources on the subject property. Ms. Ruelke noted that the Manager's House is on CPR Unit 1 and the developer does not have site control over that property. The developer has no plans for the Manager's House. The developer will be updating the road, so access to that area may be affected in terms of making the road more usable and bringing more people in to see the subject property.</p> <p>Ms. Larson clarified that Ms. Ruelke is the County's developer's representative. Mr. Roversi responded that this project is not formally the County's housing development project, it falls under a private developer. The County is supportive of the project and has provided a small amount of financing for it. The County's Housing Agency has no ownership in this project but is supportive of it to assist in helping to seek State funding, which the developer was successful in obtaining. As noted earlier, the County's Housing Agency provided a very small loan to help finance the project. The County has no ownership in the property or in the future development to be built.</p> <p>Planning Director Hull stated that when the project was approved approximately one decade ago, it went through the KHPRC process, the Planning Commission took those comments for what they were, and acted and approved the zoning permits. The developer at that time may have been planning to use Federal tax funds and tax credits. This developer is using Federal tax funds and tax credits. This initiates the Section 106 process and has to come before the KHPRC to get comments as a part of receiving Federal funding. This Section 106 process is being re-started from one that had been done previously. The Planning Commission and Planning Department generally intends to take the recommendations of the KHPRC for its various statutory permit responsibilities and fold in any requirements into those respective zoning permits. That type of leverage situation is not experienced in this specific request because the zoning permits for this project have already been issued. There is no authority offered to re-open the zoning permit process. Any comments provided by the KHPRC essentially are advisory to the applicant pursuant to the Section 106 process.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Vice Chair Gately asked if given that there is a historic home nearby, if the developer intends to follow a specific style of design for these buildings that are friendly to that. Ms. Ruelke stated that they are using the same architect that was used for Phase 1 of the project so will be similar to that in style. The project is three stories, eight-plexus. The style is what would be considered “plantation style.” A comparative project would be the Koa’e Housing Project which is located between Kōloa and Po’ipū.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo stated that Koamalu is a place name long associated with the area of the project. She asked if the metes and bounds of the designated project area the same as the original Koamalu. She stated that historical descriptions going back to the middle of the 19th Century talk about and note the kukui tree and Koa tree plantings. Chair Remoaldo wondered if any of those descendants of those trees still exist on the property. Ms. Ruelke stated that she was unsure of the status of the trees on the property, but that the developer did do an archaeological literary review and can provide the Commission with any information that may be contained therein. Chair Remoaldo stated that Koamalu could be literally translated to mean the shade of the Koa trees and that is why she is inquiring. She reminded everyone that in previous discussions during Phase 1, the Commission was hoping that the developer would commit to saving at least one of the large trees in Phase 1 and hopefully the trees would be taken into consideration when planning development in Phase 2.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo indicated Phase 2 is a heavily vegetated area and asked the developer about the topography of the area and plans related to that. Ms. Ruelke stated that three out of the five buildings will be slab on grade. The two other buildings are going to be post and beam because of the topography. The east side of the parcel slopes down very low so the developer cannot build that far down. Ms. Ruelke apologized for not including the Conceptual Site Plan for the project but stated that the Conceptual Site Plan shows that most of the work will be done on the west side of the property because of the difficulty of building on the sloped side.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo asked approximately how much of the property would be cleared and whether any of the existing vegetation would be retained. Ms. Ruelke responded that a final grading plan is not yet available for Phase 2 and that there is currently only a conceptual design. She further noted that when a final plan is completed, it will be submitted to SHPD to review.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Chair Remoaldo stated that one of the comments that the Commission made when discussing Phase 1 was to move the historic resources together and to restore/interpret the site as part of a long-term plan. She wondered about the existing residence and that it was going to be demolished and whether any consideration was made to preserve the particular building and using it to interpret the site. Ms. Ruelke responded that during initial discussions about relocating the single-family home was to move it to CPR 1 if Aloha Church, the owners of the property, wanted it. Ms. Ruelke believes that Aloha Church was not interested in taking the building. The County's Housing Agency did discuss with the developer the possibility of having an outside party take the home and move it elsewhere for preservation or restoration purposes. Chair Remoaldo asked Ms. Ruelke to confirm that demolition was not the final decision on that structure. Ms. Ruelke acknowledged that the status is being discussed and that if someone on-island could use the structure, they would be in favor of that and support that ideal use.</p> <p>Mr. Ida asked about the requirements or restrictions put on this property by SHPD. Ms. Ruelke responded that as far as requirements go, the developer did need to do the Hawai'i Revised Statutes 6E review, along with the Section 106 process with SHPD for permit review purposes. Those processes are currently in review for Phase 1. For Phase 2 the developer initiated the Section 106 with SHPD. There have been no comments returned from SHPD yet. There will also be an additional 6E review for Phase 2 as well. Ms. Ruelke noted that SHPD will take a look at the single-family home as well and let the developer know what they will have to do with that, though no comments have been received just yet.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked the developer whether as part of the Section 106, if they contacted the Grove Farm Homestead regarding the remaining structure. Ms. Ruelke acknowledged that Grove Farm Homestead might have been a part of the consultation list of NHOs or special interest groups. Ms. Ruelke stated that they had only received one response, but that she does not believe it was the Grove Farm group that responded. Ms. Ruelke stated that she would provide the Commission with the list of those that were contacted. Ms. Larson clarified that she was thinking that Grove Farm has a Manager's House and an Owner's House and that this structure and the Manager's House may have gone together. Chair Remoaldo stated that the structure in question was the Lihu'e Plantation Manager's House and not Grove Farm. However, Chair Remoaldo stated that</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>it was someone staying at Grove Farm who wrote about Koamalu, so it is possible that they have more information on this area.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked whether Koamalu leads into Grove Farm. Chair Remoaldo concurred that the discussion is approximately from the same era, but the specific relationship to each other is uncertain. Ms. Larson indicated that her line of questioning was due to her wondering whether Grove Farm had any interest in wanting to preserve this last remaining structure. Ms. Larson noted that the era being discussed and that area are very important to the history of Kaua'i. Ms. Larson feels that this developer may have the perfect opportunity to do something at that site to preserve an important piece of Kaua'i's history, such as replanting some of the groves, returning Koamalu to a place it was known because of the shade of the Koa trees, and preserving memories of the people and those who lived in those houses.</p> <p>Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte asked whether any response was received from descendants of people who lived there. Ms. Ruelke stated that they did not receive any response from any descendants. Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte asked if contact was made with any living relatives. Ms. Ruelke stated that she would have to check on that as she does not remember seeing any individual names on the contact list, as most were associated with specific groups. Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte stated that she provided the letter to a co-worker who is a descendant of the Isenberg family. Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte recommended to the developer that perhaps they could consider putting an advertisement in the local newspaper to provide notice and to provide the community the opportunity to provide feedback, especially for those who may no longer reside in the Līhu'e area. Ms. Ruelke stated that they did not do any notice in the newspaper and that she appreciates the feedback on other ways to reach out to descendants.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo asked whether the Commission would consider a motion to gather comments and include them in a letter to the appropriate people and offices.</p> <p>Mr. Gately stated that he interpreted the letter provided in the agenda packet that the various consultations with Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHO) and Potential Consulting Parties had been completed and wanted to note that on the record.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Larson recapped the discussion and provided the following summary of the Commission's discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developer is asked to do what can be done to not demolish the remaining residence that remains. • The developer is asked to preserve or restore the groves that tie to the place name of that area. • The developer is asked to continue contact to people who have ties to the area, may have lived on the property, etc. <p>Ms. Qunisaat stated that as an NHO, she did receive a consultation letter so she can validate that those letters did go out as required. She further inquired as to whether the developer put together a Ka Pa'akai analysis and felt that responses to that process were still outstanding. As such Ms. Quinsaas expressed her interest in receiving those responses.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo asked for clarification as to who the letter would be sent to. Director Hull indicated that the letter from the KHPRC would be sent to the applicant. Chair Remoaldo then asked if the letter would be shared with anyone else. Ms. Valenciano stated that the consultation process is still open and the KHPRC is one body providing comments, but that there could be other could providing comments as well. Once that period closes, all of those comments get collected, the agency is responsible for cataloging and recording it, and then it gets transmitted to SHPD as a part of their record. Whether more groups or individuals need to be contacted, that would fall under the responsibility of the applicant or agency.</p> <p>Mr. Roversi stated that the consultation process is still on-going. Comments from the Section 106 process or from SHPD have not yet been received. The KHPRC is just one entity amongst many and all the comments will be compiled and looked at upon receipt.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved that the Commission consolidate comments in a letter to include requests to the developer that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Other entities be notified regarding the plans for the property, 2. The existing residence not be demolished, 3. The preservation or restoration of Koa and kukui trees be considered as a part of the plan,

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		and 4. The applicant considers interpretation of the history of the site, and that the Commission sends said letter to the appropriate people and offices related to this agenda item. The motion was seconded by Ms. Summers. Motion carried 7:0
	There being no objections, item E. General Business was taken pursuant to the amended agenda.	
E. General Business	<p>1. Briefing on introduction to reading architectural plans.</p> <p>Director Hull asked if there were any members of the public wishing to testify on this agenda item. There were no members of the public present to testify on this item.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano stated that approximately one year ago, the Department started a miniseries that never really continued. The miniseries started with Mr. Ida sharing a little about his world of archaeology. With Commissioners terming out soon, the Department wanted to get the miniseries back on track by focusing on architecture as a lot of the projects reviewed at the KHPRC deal with architecture and archaeology, and sometimes even both. Ms. Valenciano asked Ms. Summers to share more about architecture and in particular, reading architectural plans. Ms. Valenciano encouraged the KHPRC to ask questions and interact with Ms. Summers during this miniseries briefing.</p> <p>Ms. Summers stated that she tried to craft her presentation to give an overall look at the drawings that are received during the KHPRC review process and how they are organized. Ms. Summers presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The drawings that are received usually start with a high-level overview and get more granular as you get further into the plans. You will typically notice that the plans start with an island wide view and then get into the fine details of the project. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drawings usually include a title sheet, civil plans, landscape, and then architectural and other divisions that are typical in a set of plans. • During review, some sections such as structural details or plumbing may not be seen by the architectural team. • Used the Episcopal Church in Kapa‘a as an example as it was a set of plans looked at by the KHPRC. • Looking at the key and notes is important to see how drawings are referenced or created. • In the architectural world, looking at the slices through the buildings is what the architects are looking for and that is why 3-D graphics are provided. • Line types are very important in architectural drawings. Variations in line types are used. For example, a property line is a “dot dot dash,” the hidden line or a continuous dashed line can be used for the overhang of an eave, etc. Lines can be used for hidden items or to identify the foundation of footings. • Symbols are fairly typical in nature and used consistently. • The elevations provided are relatively flat in view and are referenced by direction. • Thicker lines can be used to identify things outside. Thinner lines can be used to identify indoor features. • The last page of plans shows the most detail and look at the very granular portion of the drawing set. These areas are typically sliced through to show various parts of buildings to give a sense to how those relationships to the different parts of the building work together. <p>Mr. Gately asked if Ms. Summers continues to see any hand-drawn documents or whether everything is now digital. Ms. Summers stated that plans are typically digital as they need to be submitted that way. Director Hull stated that the County requires plans to be filed digitally, but that there are a handful draftsmen out there who are doing hand sketches. Those draftsmen would need to then scan those plan sets for upload into the electronic plan review system. Ms. Summers stated that she felt the hand-drawn plan sets are actually easier to read than the computer-generated.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Gately asked whether the Planning Department receives any CAD files as opposed to PDF files. Director Hull stated that all files are PDFs.</p> <p>Director Hull further added that previous employees of the Planning Department could identify plan set drafters by their specific lines as there is definitely an art to drafting plans.</p> <p>Director Hull clarified that the KHPRC may not necessarily see a complete set of plans but may see different parts of it depending on what stage of the project it is at. Generally, at the Planning Commission level, the Department generally advises the applicant not to do full construction plans given that the Planning Commission may request changes and that would mean the applicant would have to redraw an entirely new set of plans. Director Hull stated that what the Planning Commission may typically see are site plans, plot plans, elevation plans, and some floor plans, as these comprise the envelope of the building. For over-the-counter permits, the submittals are mixed.</p> <p>Ms. Larson stated that she felt it would be very difficult for the staff Planner to handle as submittals differ and what the KHPRC members request may be different depending on who is serving at the time and what their specific interests are. Ms. Valenciano confirmed that she requests specific plan information based on the project and requested information needed to present to the KHPRC. The Department works very closely with the applicant and does request additional plan information if necessary and needed. The level of detail also depends on who might be presenting, such as the County's Engineering Division showing very detailed plan sets of roads, bridges, or other historic structures to the KHPRC. What Ms. Valenciano wanted to get out of this presentation is for the KHPRC to see what staff might be thinking when receiving information prior to presenting it to the KHPRC, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are we looking at?• What are they saying they are doing?• Is what they are saying in writing matching what is shown in the plans?• Are there any discrepancies?	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Summers pointed out that “E” stands for electrical, and “S” stands for structural engineering. “C” stands for civil engineering. “MPE” stands for mechanical, plumbing, and electrical.</p> <p>Mr. Gately expressed his curiosity as to whether the old paper plans get digitized and preserved. Director Hull stated that from 1972 until 2017, the plans were stored in a box. In 2017, the Department started digitizing all of the paper that came in. The Department has roughly six million pieces of paper currently stored which reflect the built environment of the island. Director Hull mentioned that the Department is asking the Council for \$1.2 million to digitize all of the plans and other documents of the Department. Through the digitization of these plans, staff will have easier access via the computer network at the touch of a button. Prior to 1972, there really was no permitting process or requirement for the County to request plans.</p> <p>Mr. Gately stated that he worked on a scanning project for the Kaua‘i Historical Society and that it is a laborious process. Director Hull concurred and identified for the KHPRC the various sizes of paper, types of paper, types of plans, etc. to further expand upon the difficulties in digitization.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked how the Department handles matching up the list of historic sites with the plans of those structures. In other words, how does the Department match up the plans of a historic structure with the structure itself. She asked whether the Department knows which historic structures the Department has plans for and which they do not. Director Hull responded that in theory, the Department should be able to. The Department is currently using GIS and associated systems to flag specific properties that are historic in nature or on the historic list once any application is submitted related to those properties. Once the historic flag is triggered, those projects are automatically transmitted to Ms. Valenciano for further review. The Department’s list is limited to projects that were vetted by the Planning Department and not necessarily all projects on the island, as some 6E projects may not be on the list due to reviews by other agencies.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked if there was a way to create a comprehensive list of all properties, including those not included on the Department’s list. Director Hull stated that with the resources in-place now, an analysis could be done on the properties that are on the list and what plans may be needed to complete the inventory of plans. Director Hull expressed angst at taking it further and</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>tracking down plan sets that are not in inventory or evaluating the list to see which properties may be missing as that would be time intensive and be a strain on the Department's current human and financial resources. Ms. Larson asked whether plans could be obtained for properties currently on the State or National Register. Director Hull stated that the Department could look at that list but anticipates finding that many of the structures or properties on the State or National Register are structures constructed before plan sets were required by the County. Ms. Larson stated that if any modifications were ever made, that as-built plans may be available. Director Hull agreed that Ms. Larson is correct. Ms. Larson indicated that it would be nice to know how many of those structures or properties the County plan does have sets for. Director Hull committed to discussing this matter further with his staff.</p> <p>Ms. Larson expressed interest in possible consolidating plans that Mr. Gately scanned at the Kaua'i Historical Society with the Planning Department's plans. Mr. Gately confirmed that his plan sets were just plantation materials from Kekaha and Līhu'e.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo stated that she would be appreciative if Ms. Summers could provide a glossary of all the terminology, symbols, etc. used on plan sets. Ms. Summers responded that there is a guidebook that provides that information. Ms. Larson stated that the book is available at the Līhu'e Library.</p>	
F. Communications	<p>There being no objections, item F. Communications was taken out of order.</p> <p>There were no Communications on the Commission's agenda.</p>	
G. Unfinished Business	<p>There was no Unfinished Business on the Commission's agenda.</p>	
I. Executive Session	<p>There being no objections, item I. Executive Session was taken out of order.</p> <p>The Commission had no items for Executive Session.</p>	
J. Announcements	<p>There were no announcements.</p>	
K. Selection of	<p>Ms. Valenciano stated that April 18, 2024, is the next date for a scheduled meeting. The</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics	Department is still in the process of finalizing agenda items.	
K. Adjournment	Chair Remoaldo expressed the Commission's appreciation for Mr. Ida's and Ms. Summers' service on the KHPRC, and for their leadership.	<p>Mr. Ida moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo adjourned the meeting at 1:59 p.m.</p>

Submitted by: Arleen L. Kuwamura
 Arleen Kuwamura, Commission Support Clerk

Reviewed and Approved by: _____
 Susan Remoaldo, Chair

- (X) Approved as circulated at the 05/16/2024 Meeting.
 () Approved with amendments. See minutes of _____ meeting.