

**CULTURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
FEBRUARY 2, 2012**

*\* All documents, including written testimony, that was submitted for or at this meeting are filed in the minutes file and are available for public viewing at the Maui County Department of Planning, 250 S. High St., Wailuku, Maui, Hawai'i. \*\**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Cultural Resources Commission (Commission) was called to order by Commission Member, Erik Fredericksen, at approximately 10:10 a.m., Thursday, February 2, 2012, in the Planning Department Conference Room, first floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Wailuku, Island of Maui.

A quorum of the Commission was present (see Record of Attendance).

Chair Erik Fredericksen: I'd like to welcome everybody to the - what is it? February 2, 2012 meeting of the Maui County Cultural Resources Commission. I hope everybody's had a nice start to 2012, and now we're into the second month - pretty unbelievable. Okay, first item of business is introduction of our new Commission Member. Stanley, would you like to do that or --

Mr. Stanley Solamillo: No. You can.

Chair Fredericksen: I will. I'd like to welcome Kahulu Maluo over to our Commission. I had a chance to talk a little brief story with her and she's involved with the MACC, and I will let her just give us a real quick intro. I'd like to welcome you.

**B. INTRODUCTION OF NEW COMMISSION MEMBER - KAHULU MALUO**

Ms. Kahulu Maluo: Thank you so much, Chairperson. It's an honor to be here. I'm Kahulu Maluo, and, first and most importantly, I'm a kumu hula. I've been for 15 years. One of two kumu hula of Halau Na Lei Kaumaka O Uka. And you're probably going to learn very quick that I get very emotional about things that are important to me. So I promise to try and keep it all under control. But we've been teaching hula and Hawaiian culture here on the island for 15 years, my sister and I, and I also have been employed at the Maui Arts & Cultural Center, working with the artists as well as taking artists into the rural communities, like Moloka'i, Lana'i, and Hana. I felt it was time for me to be more proactive and participate, and it's my honor to be here. Thank you so much.

Chair Fredericksen: And thank you so much. Didn't mean to put you on the spot. I just was wanting to -- just so all the Commission Members could get a real quick synopsis,

which you just provided, a really lovely synopsis because that's such a -- what you are bringing to the Commission is going to be very -- will just really help out, so, once again, welcome.

Ms. Maluo: Thank you.

### **C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2012 MEETING**

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, Item C, approval of minutes of the January 5 meeting over on Moloka'i. Any comments?

Ms. Rhiannon Chandler: Chair?

Chair Fredericksen: Yes, Rhiannon?

Ms. Chandler: I just have a couple of corrections of spelling for a native plant name, and the only reason why I'm making a note is because if they try to look it up, you know, then they might not be able to find it. So, can I tell you? It's on page 31, at the bottom --

Chair Fredericksen: Suzie, would it be easiest for -- if Rhiannon provided you after or would you like to try to do it --

Ms. Suzie Esmeralda: That's fine.

Chair Fredericksen: Is that okay? And that was it? Any other comments?

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. One more on page 33, at the top.

Chair Fredericksen: Same thing, a plant?

Ms. Chandler: Same plant name.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. It's actually really simple. It's just one.

Chair Fredericksen: It's just one? Okay, go ahead and spell it out.

Ms. Chandler: Okay, so it's, "ae ae." And the way that it's spelled is "ai." And so ae ae is different than ai ai.

Chair Fredericksen: Yes. Different.

Ms. Chandler: Mahalo.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other comments?

Ms. Brandis Sarich: I have one.

Chair Fredericksen: Brandis.

Ms. Brandis Sarich: On page 15, the word, where I speak, and it says, "defensive," it should say, "offensive."

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. And where's -- did you give the page number on it? I'm sorry.

Ms. Sarich: Page 15.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Did you get that, Suzie? Any other comments, corrections, additions? Okay, that having been said, do we have a motion to approve the January 5, 2012 minutes?

Mr. Raymond Hutaff: I move we approve the minutes with the suggested changes.

Chair Fredericksen: With those changes.

Ms. Chandler: Second.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

***It has been moved by Mr. Hutaff, seconded by Ms. Chandler, then unanimously***

***VOTED to approve the minutes with the suggested changes.***

Chair Fredericksen: Alright, motion passes. Item D, Advisory Review. Stanley?

*Mr. Solamillo read the following item description into the record:*

**D. ADVISORY REVIEW**

- 1. MR. GRANT SUMILE, of ADM RETAIL PLANNING & ARCHITECTURE, INC., on behalf of ABC STORES, requesting comments on Adaptive Reuse of Honolua Store and former Maui Land & Pineapple Company**

**buildings, located at 502 Office Road, TMK (2) 4-2-004:012, Lahaina, Hawai'i. The CRC may provide comments and recommendations. Public testimony will be accepted. (S. Solamillo)**

Mr. Stanley Solamillo: The Honolua Store and warehouse were erected in 1929. They are significant buildings for their association with the development of Baldwin Packers, a major pineapple producer that employed some 500 workers when the store was built and the development of the pineapple industry on Maui. Honolua Store and warehouse are also significant for their role in sustaining nearby camps of Hawaiian, Japanese, and Filipino agricultural workers. And, collectively, they comprise a good example of the type of commercial enterprise that served laborers in Maui County during the plantation period. It has been operated continuously as a general store since its construction in 1929 and was a primary source of food and supplies for the surrounding communities. Honolua Store has remained an important feature of the area as the transition was made from plantation agriculture to tourism. Today, it serves local workers as well as visitors with meals, groceries, and other merchandise.

In 2006, Mason Architects completed Historic American Building Survey, or HABS, documentation for the Honolua Store and warehouse, and the documents were approved by the Maui County Cultural Resources Commission as well as the State Historic Preservation Division, and they're identified if any of wish to go online as HABS HI521.

In 2008, Mason Architects and James Tucker and Associates also completed a rehabilitation, which included: one, strengthening of the structure of the Honolua Store, repairing the store's board and batten walls and windows, and adding ramps and railings to meet accessibility requirements; two, adding a new commercial kitchen, deli counter and coffee bar, and lanai; three, preserving the store's wooden plank floors, ceilings, merchandise cabinets, wood windows, and other historic elements; and, four, reconstructing a warehouse behind the store.

In 2009, the renovation received the Building Industry Association, or BIA, Hawai'i Award for commercial remodeling. In view of the sensitive rehabilitation completed in 2008, the store building retained its eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A and C.

In 2011, the operations of the Honolua Store were taken over by ABC Stores, a company know for its tourist oriented shops in Waikiki. ADM Retail Planning and Architecture, Inc., or ADM, another BIA award recipient was hired by ABC Stores to increase the store's square footage, provide new entry points, and expand the store's dining facilities between the store and warehouse. ADM submitted a design and rendering, which remove the original fenestration and provided new entries in the front facades of the store and warehouse.

Since the fenestration of the Honolua Store and warehouse is unique, authentic and constitute character defining elements associated with the Japanese carpenters who built it, and since they're similar to the former Hawaiian Pineapple Company, or HAPCO, buildings in the baseyard of Lana`i city, CR staff recommend that they be retained and that only one new entry point be used. ADM revised the original design and is submitting the attached concept design along with the design for the installation of photovoltaic panels on the building's roof plates.

This gives you an example of what the store's current conditions are. The expansion areas are defined in blue. This gives you the look of the front facades, which face the public right-of-way. This is the proposed rehabilitation of the store and increase in square footage. And this is the proposed new entry point plus enclosure of the courtyard between the two buildings and the retention of the original fenestration. If you have any questions, Grant is here, from ADM, to answer any.

Chair Fredericksen: Thank you, Stanley. I've got one question that just comes at the top of my mind; actually, two. First one: What does "CR" stand for?

Mr. Solamillo: Cultural resources.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. And then what's the proposed square footage increase? Okay, go ahead and come up to the podium and introduce yourself, please. The reason I'm asking that one is I just -- I hadn't received this and I didn't have time to request another copy or a copy of it until I just got it when I was in here. Yeah, go ahead and introduce yourself, please.

Mr. Grant Sumile: Hi.

Chair Fredericksen: Good morning.

Mr. Sumile: Good morning. I'm Grant Sumile, from ADM Retail Planning and Architecture. We're the architects working on the ABC Store project in Kapalua. The existing store square footage is approximately 6,050 square feet, and we are proposing to expand it by roughly -- about 900 square feet.

Chair Fredericksen: Thank you. Okay, I'll probably have some other questions, but let's let the Commission Members, please, weigh in at this point. Brandis, any comments?

Ms. Sarich: Yes. Thank you.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. I thought so.

Ms. Sarich: I wanted to say that I like what you've done with it. It really looks great. And -- but here are my questions: Will the store retain its eligibility for listing in the National Historic Register with the new opening and the courtyard being closed in?

Mr. Solamillo: That question would have to be asked at SHPD and NPS.

Ms. Sarich: Okay.

Mr. Solamillo: Originally, when the original proposal came through, there were multiple points of entry and changed fenestration. In this scenario, we wanted to make sure that we're only punching one opening and that that opening is reversible in that it could go back to being closed again.

Ms. Sarich: Thank you.

Chair Fredericksen: Stanley, while you're up there, I might as well put you on the spot. In your opinion, understanding that SHPD needs to weigh in, what do you think of this in terms of the eligibility status? What's your opinion?

Mr. Solamillo: I think it's possible.

Chair Fredericksen: Possible?

Mr. Solamillo: Yeah. In fact, I've gone with the presumption that because it is a reversible change, and the change is localized and only affects one facade.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Sarich: I have one question.

Chair Fredericksen: Oh, sure. Go ahead, Brandis.

Ms. Sarich: How will that opening be closed up at night?

Mr. Sumile: It's going to be sliding partitions.

Ms. Sarich: And what are they, are they wood or metal or ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Sumile: That's yet to be determined, but we plan to make whatever the opening is, whether it's wood or metal, it's going to be made to match the existing fenestration so that it blends in.

Ms. Sarich: Okay. And then is there any way that the new in-fill is going to be delineated from the historic building? Are people going to be able to tell that this is in-fill?

Mr. Sumile: No. They won't be able to tell. Are you referring to the courtyard part that we're enclosing? We are holding that facade slightly back from the two existing facades, the two existing roof lines, for the purpose of maintaining the character that the original building had.

Ms. Sarich: Good. Because I think it should be delineated. I mean I like the idea that the story can be told that it was this, and then this was added. So I -- my -- do we want to ask questions or should I give my opinion?

Chair Fredericksen: Let's see. Any other questions from the Commission Members?

Mr. Hutaff: I have a few. On the building on the left-hand side, the lower windows, okay, are changed from its original from its original design. Is that necessary, or can the building -- you want me to go up there and point?

Mr. Sumile: Sure. Yeah. Please.

Mr. Hutaff: ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Sumile: They will be the same. They're -- yeah, that's --

Mr. Hutaff: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Are you looking at the spacing, Ray, between the two -- the window rows?

Mr. Hutaff: I'm looking at the size. Basically, you know, in looking at a historic building, you wanna try to keep it as historic and as, you know, the same as possible. And those windows are probably only maybe about six inches wider, from what I can see here, or deeper.

Mr. Sumile: Taller.

Chair Fredericksen: The bottom ones are taller.

Mr. Hutaff: Do they really need to be?

Mr. Sumile: Actually, that -- it was -- might be part of our artistic mistake.

Mr. Hutaff: Rendering?

Mr. Sumile: Yeah. We intend to keep that existing window.

Mr. Hutaff: So that it looks identical?

Mr. Sumile: Yes.

Mr. Hutaff: Second part, the left building there, behind the deli there, you got all those -- I'm assuming those are windows?

Mr. Sumile: Yes.

Mr. Hutaff: They're not doors?

Mr. Sumile: No. They're windows.

Mr. Hutaff: Okay. Are those necessary to change or can you still keep the character of the building by having those smaller windows on top, maybe adding one more in the front, so there's not really that dramatic of a change? 'Cause, believe it or not, that stands out more than anything else.

Mr. Sumile: Well, we would like to create -- perhaps what we can do is make them slightly smaller, but one of the things that's happening with the store right now is customers who are staying in the area don't find the store till maybe they've been there for three days and they didn't realize that that was actually a store. Because I think it doesn't -- the store isn't allowed to tell the story of what's inside there as you drive into the resort area, which is why we're trying to reorient the entry, that's the purpose behind it. But perhaps we can make those openings a little smaller.

Mr. Hutaff: To more fit the character of the original building. And I question that philosophy of that the people don't see the store because even with this exactly as you have it rendered, most people who go down to the Ritz side of it or go to the golf course side it, start at the upper road, they only see the back of the building anyway. It's when they turn around and leave and head up -- back up that highway do they actually see the front of the store.

Mr. Sumile: Right. It faces its back to the --

Mr. Hutaff: Right. So coming down, the people don't necessarily see it. Most people, who are visitors, even in the golf courses and stuff like that, unless they've been here for a while, okay, do go down from the upper road, Honoapi`ilani Highway, drive down through



the Ritz, stay at the Ritz, stay at Kapalua, go to the golf course, and then continue on around the bottom road as a means of sightseeing. So changing this front in order to make it, you know, more seeable by the visitor or by the person so that they don't have to wait three days till they find it, that won't change.

Chair Fredericksen: Or we could probably, absent the survey, to back that up not -- that's absolutely not a known; that's only speculative.

Mr. Hutaff: That's true. I am speculating, but I'm doing that based upon our experience. One of our pickup locations is Honolua Store and so that's what we find ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. And that's an interesting point because you do have a presence there as it were.

Ms. Sarich: May I respond to Ray's comment? Personally, with historic preservation and adaptive reuse, I would like to see the additions delineated from what's already there. So, to me, I think they've done a good job. It's actually architecturally pleasing and it, obviously, is an addition. So, in my mind, that creates the story that we're trying to tell that, you know, this is historic and then this was added. So I don't have an issue with those big windows.

Mr. Hutaff: Cool. I do.

Ms. Sarich: I wouldn't want them to match. Okay.

Mr. Hutaff: But not a big issue.

Ms. Sarich: Okay.

Mr. Hutaff: I would just like to see if the facade has, as much as possible, stayed the same, but I definitely understand the need for that big door entry.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, I guess the other thing, just going off of what Brandis said, is if something like this is to go forward, there should be some -- just so it doesn't completely blend in so the assumption is that it's all original. Go ahead.

Mr. Hutaff: That's a good point.

Ms. Chandler: Thank you, Chair. I tend to think that if you want to market it as a store, this new opening is gonna do that. It's not so much the windows, it's that big opening. It kinda makes it look like an ABC Store that you would see in Waikiki, as you drive pass. So the windows, to me, don't so much add to that, and I would like to see them maybe, as Brandis

said, you know, make a delineation that this is a remodeling but if you could not make them so large, like I think that they do kinda stand out, and for the purpose of telling the story that it's historic, I think people are going to get it.

Ms. Makalapua Kanuha: If I may, as well. Yeah, 'cause if I was walking down, I would -- it would already look like ABC Store so, for myself, I worked for Maui Land & Pineapple Company for like ten years, from 1990 to 2000, and I know we're talking about the building outside but I know that they had a lot of artifacts inside about the history of the Hawaiian camp, Japanese, camp, Filipino camps, so my question is: Are these, when people walk into the Honolua Store, are they really walking into Honolua Store or are they walking into the ABC Store?

Mr. Sumile: To answer that question, that's -- keeping that character is also important to ABC Stores, so we're making a concerted effort to redo the design of the fixtures that the customers will experience, to have trims that make it match the architecture that's going to be on the exterior, and the interior wall displays are going to be made to look more vintage, and we intend to display artifacts and some of the historical content. We have discussed with Maui Land & Pine the opportunity to use some of those old photos and passing on that information to the customer.

Ms. Kanuha: And the only reason why I wanted to say that is that we still have kupuna that live on the West Side and some of them tend to go out to Honolua Store, drink coffee, sit outside, talk story, so that's a real big part of the history of the place. So that's what my concern is is the building, but the mo`olelo of the place.

Chair Fredericksen: I mean, if you will, it's an anchor to what was there before 'cause it's dramatically -- I mean it's dramatically changed over time, but it's even more dramatically changed now with the exist of Maui Pine from any kind of pineapple activity.

Ms. Kanuha: I've had some feedback and people said I knew I was in ABC Store when they walking into it. I'm hoping that the stories of the plantation is still preserved in that space and --

Ms. Chandler: I would say that's critical because for many people, like you said, this is the last part of their home 'cause their homes are not there anymore, right? They're underneath the resort area. So for this store, I think as much as it's a commercial operation going forward like to today and into the future, it has to be the mission of your organization to retain that for these people because their kids, you know, will never know unless that kinda historical information is in there. But going back to the opening of the store, that large area that Brandis had asked how will you close it, maybe something that looks, just like you said, like the exterior of the building itself so that when it's closed, it actually looks like the original rendering of the building. That would be really nice.

Chair Fredericksen: Just listening to Makalapua and Rhiannon, it brought something back up that I had been thinking about a little earlier. This is a really unique opportunity for ABC Stores because most of them are, you know, I'm not a real large fan, let's just leave it at that, but, in this instance, it's a historic building that has a lot of character and it's an opportunity for a large corporation to recognize that and I mean, frankly, take constructive advantage of this situation because it is a neat building; it's got the character, it's got the history, and recognize that and acknowledge it. And I mean, quite frankly, for tourists, the folks who come in, I mean that's interesting. It's not like you're just like, hey, anywhere, wherever. It's, yeah, it's an ABC Store but, yeah, it's the store that's in a unique setting and it recognizes and acknowledges that. So it's a real, in my opinion, a real positive opportunity for a large corporation to give some acknowledgment to something that's unique.

Mr. Sumile: We agree with that, and ABC and our team is, you know, excited at that opportunity to show the customers a different message and, you know, inside the store, it's not going to be a regular ABC Store. There's going to be a fresh deli, and fresh produce, and a fine wine area, and the displays are going to be much different than you're seeing right now. The displays in there right now are temporary displays from when they took over this space, so they're going to be displaying in baskets, and carts with wheels, and so ABC is very excited about the opportunity to do something that fits in with the community.

Chair Fredericksen: That's very positive, and it can be - I don't know if it's the right term - but it can be a showcase store for the organization. Warren, you look like you're -- have something to say ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Osako: Yeah, I just have a comment 'cause I did spend some time there when I was a kid because I had family that lived there, worked for the pineapple plantation, and, you know, I look at this today, and I've driven by and I don't even recognize it because, to me, it's out of context that the plantation village is not there and, you know, that the baseyard where all the trucks were and everything was really close by, and so, you know, it's almost like I don't recognize the place.

Mr. Hutaff: All the more reason to have the last building standing.

Mr. Osako: Yeah.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other comments? Brandis.

Ms. Sarich: I just wanted to say that I'm just really pleased that they're choosing to adapt this building rather than tear it down or something terrible like that. I think that the architects have done a good job of delineating and upgrading -- updating it in a way that is sensitive to the past. I just -- I'm really excited. I think that by buildings evolving, it keeps

history alive and even though they are changed, I mean it's still the same building, you still have memories of it, and that evolution of an old building is really exciting compared to just losing an old building.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. Well, and hence the term too, "adaptive reused." I mean --

Ms. Sarich: Yeah.

Chair Fredericksen: There's adaptation. I had just something for you, Brandis. The -- well, first, for the architect, what's the cover that is on the -- above the opening? What's that called? A canopy?

Mr. Hutaff: A canopy.

Chair Fredericksen: Now, is that a period canopy?

Mr. Sumile: I could say that --

Chair Fredericksen: Or similar?

Mr. Sumile: Yeah. I mean you'd see those types of marquees along, you know, the Haleiwa Street frontage and, you know, the construction of that time of commercial buildings, and we intend to make the joints and the mechanisms look like it's from that period.

Chair Fredericksen: And again, I mean it is something that's different so it's not supposed to look, I guess, exactly like -- well, there wasn't anything there. That was my two cents on that.

Ms. Sarich: I appreciate that. I think that the new opening is so radically different that what would have been there that the awning over it just kind of keeps telling that story that we like to tell as preservationists.

Chair Fredericksen: That was courtesy of our assistant director. Any other questions or comments? Yes, Warren.

Mr. Osako: I have a question for Stanley. Stanley, do you think it would be possible to get a map of the old plantation village as it was, you know, during the plantation times, like sort of the one I got for you of Pu`ukoli`i?

Mr. Solamillo: I'll try and see if --

Mr. Osako: Maui Land & Pine should have.

Chair Fredericksen: Warren, are you talking for about something inside the store?

Mr. Osako: Well, if they wanna, you know, present it as what it was, yeah, they could, you know, probably use something like that to show what was there when, you know, when it was a community.

Chair Fredericksen: Maybe where, if there is going to be some sort of -- there should be some exhibits. I don't know. Are you folks planning on -- could you come back up? Just another question for you. On your exhibits inside the store, are you planning on having them concentrated, or spread out, or you're not sure yet?

Mr. Sumile: We'd like to spread them out throughout the store.

Chair Fredericksen: It might be an interesting addition if there is -- if it would be possible to accommodate one of the old maps, I mean especially if like it was one of those old linen maps of the area.

Mr. Sumile: Yeah. I think that's a fantastic idea.

Chair Fredericksen: That would be really cool. Those are neat.

Mr. Sumile: Yep.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other questions, comments? Okay, well, thank you. Well, at this point, let's take public testimony. If there's anyone in the audience who'd like to testify on this item, please come forward and state your name. Okay, no one. Okay. Well, we'll close public testimony. Any other comments from the Commission Members or --

Ms. Chandler: I have a question for Stan. The HABS documentation that was done previously, is that sufficient for this new renovation?

Mr. Solamillo: Well, it covered the entire group of buildings.

Ms. Chandler: So then if it was -- does SHPD review this afterwards or before? How do they do that?

Mr. Solamillo: Before they get a permit.

Ms. Chandler: Before they get a permit. Okay.

Mr. Solamillo: ...(inaudible)... then it'll go to SHPD.

Ms. Chandler: Okay, so we would not know until then whether or not that would jeopardize the listing, but as you're saying --

Mr. Solamillo: Well, it's not listed.

Ms. Chandler: Oh, it's not listed?

Mr. Solamillo: No. This has never been listed.

Ms. Chandler: Oh, the eligibility to list it?

Mr. Solamillo: Right.

Ms. Chandler: Okay.

Mr. Solamillo: Yeah.

Ms. Chandler: And because --

Mr. Solamillo: It remains up to SHPD whether, you know, whether the eligibility is in fact compromised. 'Cause, I mean, if we're going to get purist, you know, this store, like the pineapple service buildings at Lana`i City, they don't have canopies like this. You know, the fenestration looks really contrived, right. The windows just kinda don't look right but that's the way they built them and that's what makes them very unique, and so it's -- it's the type of buildings that were built for these pineapple plantations and you can see them over at Maunaloa, you can see them at Kualapu`u, and you can see them at Lana`i City and here so --

Ms. Chandler: Okay. And one of the qualifications is that it could be undone if it had to be.

Mr. Solamillo: Well, the thing was initially when they came in they were going to change all the fenestration to match, you know, something that wasn't there, so the thing was initially to get them to retain the existing fenestration and minimize whatever openings may be put into the building to one, which is located in that larger gable end. But, technically, as I said, if we were a purist, there's no canopy there; there shouldn't be an opening there. You should really retain the original points of egress and exit.

Ms. Chandler: Thank you, Stan.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other questions, comments, discussion? This is advisory.

Mr. Solamillo: Correct. And this is one of the few times that we get where someone comes in and wants to keep a building, and, you know, nine out of ten, they're all going down. And, initially, when a HABS job is done on a project, you feel that it's a goner and that's usually what we've been experiencing for the last ten years.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, and again, the adaptive reuse is -- it would be good to encourage rather than discourage. Brandis, did you --

Ms. Sarich: I just was trying to sum up kind of the things that we wanted and it sounds like we definitely would like to see a map of the plantation in the store along with artifacts from that era, I think that we still have some debate about how we feel about the windows in the addition, I like those in-fill windows because, to me, it delineates it as a separate thing.

Chair Fredericksen: It doesn't blend in --

Ms. Sarich: Right.

Chair Fredericksen: With the appearance that that's the original building.

Ms. Sarich: I think that it, architecturally, the elevation looks good now, and so I'm happy with it, but I know that other Commissioners may out vote me on that. And then I think that we would like some sensitivity to how the new opening is closed up. And, perhaps, that when the building is closed, it would get returned to looking like the side elevation again. I think that's our main points, and other than that, we're just really pleased that they are reusing this rather than coming in to demolish it.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other additions?

Ms. Chandler: Also that the architect had noted that there's an artistic error in this that the bottom windows are not actually going to be taller than the --

Chair Fredericksen: On the right --

Ms. Chandler: On the right building, yeah. So that's just one other thing.

Chair Fredericksen: And I think that -- Stanley, do we need to do a motion on this one or is that -- okay. Because of the -- the discrepancy of the size of the windows, the lower windows on the building on the right, let's -- if it's desired, somebody want to put a motion out there that it should be the same size as it was --

Ms. Chandler: I think she means the windows in-between the two buildings.

Chair Fredericksen: Hold on. Hold on. What?

Ms. McLean: The only discrepancy there seems to be among the comments is the size of the windows on the addition. So I was suggesting that that be one motion, and once that's voted on, then one motion to include all the comments, all the issues that have been brought up.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Thanks. If, Ray, you're still -- if it's still a concern about the size of the windows, and if you'd like to put a motion forward for the addition --

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah, I'd like to move that the windows on the center of the building sort of match a little better the view of the buildings as whole so they don't -- well, I don't know how to make a motion on this. I'll just tell you how I look at it and then you guys can tell me what words to use. Again, I was surfing when all this stuff was happening. The windows of the center building, the center part of the extension, dramatically change the look of the building, not so much the fact that they've added 630-something square feet or 375 square feet to that, but it's more the windows themselves. If you look at the other one up there, you can see that there are windows in that portion there --

Chair Fredericksen: Further along.

Mr. Hutaff: That connects the two buildings. Keeping them about that size, I think, would not really dramatically change the look of the building as it appears now. The front door part of it, the big door, entry door, you know, I think given the fact that the ABC Store is trying to, you know, save the building and keep the building, can only work if it's profitable to them, and they're going to need that in order to keep the building. So if I could make a motion that the windows on that existing extension in the center here, okay, yeah, those two, all of the windows here --

Mr. Osako: This is on the left building. It's not on the extension.

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah. Oh, I get it. But if they could not be so long and tall.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, again, to revisit what we were talking about before, or Brandis was speaking about, is that addition is new and is something that is not -- it shouldn't be indistinguishable from the rest of the structures.

Mr. Hutaff: ...(inaudible)... I get what you guys are saying, and I agree --

Chair Fredericksen: Warren?

Mr. Hutaff: To the point, visually.



Mr. Osako: There's one window that they put in the existing building that's also that big window.

Chair Fredericksen: That's facing -- that's facing the side.

Mr. Osako: To the side, yeah. So that doesn't appear in the original building - that window.

Chair Fredericksen: Oh, I see what you're talking about.

Mr. Osako: 'Cause that's an addition.

Chair Fredericksen: Into the actual building itself.

Mr. Osako: In the actual old building.

Chair Fredericksen: Brandis, did you catch that or have a comment on that?

Ms. Sarich: I did, and I was kinda letting it go, but I guess I would prefer to see that not be a window, and I would prefer that the addition keep its different windows.

Mr. Osako: Yeah, 'cause that compromises the old building.

Chair Fredericksen: Right.

Ms. Sarich: Yeah.

Chair Fredericksen: That's a very good point, Warren. Thank you.

Ms. Sarich: Yeah. Thank you for bringing that up.

Mr. Osako: I don't know if that's just the same thing, the artistic, the one window that's actually on the side of the original building, the left ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Sarich: Yeah.

Mr. Sumile: Facing perpendicular to where the new opening is going to be? The new entry is going to be? Okay.

Ms. Chandler: Is there another one facing, on this building, facing out? 'Cause we can't see it if there is.

Mr. Sumile: On the --

Ms. Chandler: On the building you said you're not changing the right-hand side building.

Chair Fredericksen: If you're facing it, the side that's on the side of the ADM --

Ms. Chandler: Yep.

Mr. Sumile: This side here?

Ms. Sarich: Oh, you're right, Rhiannon, they did add a window there too.

Ms. Chandler: On this side. The other building. Yeah, that's --

Ms. McLean: Looking at the site plan, that seems to be almost flush, it's only slightly recessed, so it doesn't seem that there would be room for a window facing that opposite way.

Ms. Chandler: Okay.

Mr. Sumile: We can keep that existing. There's an existing fenestration there, but we'll keep it.

Ms. Sarich: Okay.

Mr. Osako: Yeah, because there's no windows on the side of the new entry on the original building, right?

Chair Fredericksen: Thank you for catching that, Warren.

Mr. Sumile: Yeah, I kind of black lined over it. At the time, it was just to, on this plan, was just to, not necessarily show where -- make a fenestration comparison, it was just to show the outline of what the existing space was versus -- but to respond to what your concern is, we can keep the existing fenestrations on both sides flanking the entry.

Ms. Sarich: Okay.

Chair Fredericksen: On the buildings that have been there for a long time --

Mr. Sumile: Right.

Chair Fredericksen: The new part is -- that's --

Ms. Chandler: New windows.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. I agree with that.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, Ray, are you -- did someone else want to make a motion about keeping the windows as they're presented on the addition itself?

Ms. Chandler: I move that the, as we're looking at this concept rendering, that the windows that are added to the new section be as they are, but any windows that are added to the original building, either near the entrance or if there is one across, which I think --

Chair Fredericksen: That's flushed ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Chandler: Okay, that's flushed. That that window not be added to the old building. That new windows be added to new adjustments, but no new window be added to the old.

Mr. Sumile: Okay.

Mr. Solamillo: We could do that in one summary statement that says, "Keep original fenestration."

Ms. Sarich: Thank you.

Mr. Solamillo: Or, "Maintain original fenestration."

Mr. Hutaff: There you go.

Ms. Chandler: Thank you.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, so then we're putting that in?

Ms. Sarich: We're all agreed on that so we can put it in our overall motion now?

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, now --

Ms. Kanuha: Is there a second?

Chair Fredericksen: Before we go further though --

Mr. Solamillo: We need to do whatever the Deputy Director suggested.

Chair Fredericksen: We're going back to the addition and the window size. So that would need a motion? So did you wanna go back and make a motion only on the addition, and then we'll --

Ms. Chandler: No. I think Stan said we could just say, "keep all the original fenestration."

Mr. Solamillo: Yeah, but that was handling all the fenestration things that you were trying to say.

Ms. McLean: There's still the question of --

Mr. Solamillo: You still have the question.

Ms. McLean: The size of the windows in the addition.

Ms. Chandler: Oh. Are you okay, Ray, or -- no. Okay, Ray's not okay, so I can't make a motion for you though.

Mr. Hutaff: You know, we all get to vote so it's not a big deal.

Ms. McLean: It's just for there to be a vote whether they are okay as they're presented or whether the majority would like to see them smaller and more in keeping with existing.

Ms. Chandler: I think in my motion that I was trying to make earlier, I referenced this artist rendering and say to go with this as it is and just not make any changes other than that.

Chair Fredericksen: Do we have a second?

Ms. Sarich: I'll second.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

***It has been moved by Ms. Chandler, seconded by Ms. Sarich, then***

***VOTED: that, in looking at the concept rendering that was presented, that the windows that are added to the new section be as they are, but any windows that are added to the original building, either near the entrance or if there is one across, that that window not***

***be added to the old building. That new windows be added to new adjustments, but no new window be added to the old.***

*(Assenting: R. Chandler; M. Kanuha; K. Maluo; W. Osako; B. Sarich)*  
*(Dissenting: R. Hutaff)*  
*(Excused: I. Ka`ahanui; B. U`u)*

Chair Fredericksen: Motioned carried. Thank you, Ray.

Mr. Hutaff: No worry.

Chair Fredericksen: That was good. Okay, now second motion. Yes, Stanley?

Mr. Solamillo: One more question about the addition. Do you feel, and this is a question to the architect sitting on the Commission, do you feel that the addition being flushed is better than recessing the addition to improve the differentiation between what was there and what is being added?

Chair Fredericksen: It is flushed on the one side.

Ms. Sarich: I need your guidance on that. I like it indented, but do we have a better -- is it more appropriate in historic preservation to make it flush with a batten board or something that delineates it?

Mr. Solamillo: No. I'm talking about the whole massing of the addition - instead of being flushed with --

Chair Fredericksen: With the one building ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Solamillo: With the one building, do you want it set back so that it ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Sarich: It is set back.

Ms. Chandler: It's not.

Mr. Osako: Barely.

Mr. Hutaff: Not according to the drawing.

Mr. Osako: Yeah, look at the plan.

Mr. Hutaff: The picture looks like it is though.

Ms. Sarich: Is it not indented?

Mr. Sumile: Right now ...(inaudible)... since this rendering, the way we have it, it's going to be indented about six inches but -- so, you know, it's just the architectural indentation that allows us to terminate, but --

Ms. Sarich: No. I think it should be indented.

Chair Fredericksen: More than six inches?

Ms. Sarich: No. That's fine.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay.

Ms. Sarich: We maintain the corner trim and everything that way.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. And it will be painted white, correct, the trim? Okay. Okay, so we need a second motion about the project, the overall project itself.

Ms. Sarich: I would like to make a motion that we -- do we approve this? Or do we recommend approval of this? That we recommend approval of this project with the following items included: One is that we would like a map of the plantation village in the store, and artifacts pertinent to the history of that area and the store; and we would like how the opening is closed, that new opening, to be sensitive to what the building looks like and to try to maintain that character; and then I don't know if I need to add that we would like all of the existing fenestration to be retained in the existing building.

Chair Fredericksen: Right. Yeah, that's good. Second on that?

Mr. Osako: I second.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

***It has been moved by Ms. Sarich, seconded by Mr. Osako, then unanimously***

***VOTED: to recommend approval of this project with the following items included: One is that the Commission would like a map of the plantation village in the store, and artifacts pertinent to the history of that area and the store; and the Commission would like how the opening is closed, that new opening, to be sensitive to what the building looks like and to try to maintain that character;***

***and the Commission would like all of the existing fenestration to be retained in the existing building.***

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, motion carried. And thank you for the adaptive reuse of a neat old building. Have a good one. Okay, next -- next item, Stanley. Item 2.

*Mr. Solamillo read the following item description into the record:*

2. **MR. JIM NIESS of the MAUI ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, on behalf of DR. CINDY ALBURY CHIROPRACTIC CLINIC, requesting comments on Adaptive Reuse and Business Use of the Office Building, located at 2307 West Main Street, in the Wailuku Civic Center Historic District (Maui H.D. No. 3), TMK (2) 3-4-014:005, Wailuku, Hawai'i. The CRC may provide comments and recommendations. Public testimony will be accepted. (S. Solamillo)**

Chair Fredericksen: Thanks, Stanley.

Mr. Solamillo: This is part of a group of buildings, which comprise Historic District No. 3, and they're located right here in Wailuku, and they're rather important. We see them mostly as background, but without them being there, it would be a much different place. These two maps show the location of the building in question, and the one on the left shows the configuration - High Street is on the bottom, and then West Main is on the right. These are views of this particular building. The building is owned by the church, so it's leased out, and it serves as an income-producing property to the church. So it's a contributing building to a multi-property district.

In the case of this particular building, even though it has been maintained through time, we've got significant termite damage that seems to be a our problem and water damage, and this constitutes, you know, a need to really look at the building and come up with a better way of dealing with it. What we found with these buildings, and they're called "single-wall construction" is the vernacular term that everybody uses. If they've got corner posts, they're plank frame, and if they have no corner posts, then -- excuse me. If they have corner posts, they're box frame. And if they have no corner posts, then they're just plank frame. And that was the system of building that has been in use in the islands for almost 150 years and was, essentially, it actually came out of New England during the colonial period and came across the United States, virtually ...(inaudible)... plantation as well as sharecropper housing and then was adopted for housing here in the islands.

In the case of a lot of the buildings now that are well over 100 years old, or approaching 100 years old, we're finding that they're structurally compromised, and this particular

rehabilitation is actually proposing that we build a second wall, and we frame it out as we would, do a balloon frame building, and that we refinish the interiors or rebuild the interiors, but provide this particular building with a thicker wall so that it has structural stability that it currently doesn't have, and a lot of that is due, specifically, to one end of the building being almost at grade and soaking up all the water that comes down off the hill and then the water damage gets absorbed through the rest of the structure.

These are other basic views of the building. It's a real simple building. And Jim Niess is here to answer any questions.

Chair Fredericksen: Thanks, Stanley.

Mr. Jim Niess: Good morning, Commissioners. I'm Jim Niess, from Maui Architectural Group. If you don't mind, I'll give a brief presentation on what we're intending to do here. And Stanley gave a good overview of - this is called a "Baybrook House" and we're here today for two reasons: One, to secure the Commission's approval of our repair and reconstruction plans for the Baybrook House, and then also to formalize the tenancy of Dr. Cindy Albury. I'd like to introduce Pastor Rob Kojima, Wailuku Union Church, the property owner, and Dr. Cindy Albury, of -- who's the current tenant.

I'd like to start with the building. It was built in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as Stanley pointed out; wood construction, single wall. We're all familiar with the plantation houses and the single wall, but there's something unique about this and that is the fact that it's got ten-foot ceilings in it, so it's much taller than you'd find in a plantation house, which adds to the structural instability that now that termites and time have had their way. I don't know if you folks are aware of this, but the ground termite was introduced to the island of Maui right up in that property, and we had the termites under control now, but they've already wreaked havoc. In fact, you can poke your finger right through that wall in certain places, and the painters are telling us, you know, well, just caulk that up. Well, there's nothing for the caulk to adhere to but the paint surface so -- maintenance has been good over the years. The only reason the building's still standing is that the church has been a good steward over the years, but it's time for some major structural rehabilitation. Of course, wind and earthquakes, it's the lateral stability that's seriously compromised. You recall the earthquake we had in 2007, I believe, cracks appeared up between the wall and ceiling, which tells us that the building's wracking and it's just time, and our proposed corrections involve a new layer of plywood over the exterior with battens; repair, replacement of windows and doors; standard stuff, and then, as Stanley pointed out, creating some sheer strength by putting some studs and sheer panels on the interior, painting, and caulking. It's important to note that the appearance of the building will remain unchanged.

And then, secondly, going forward, it's important to have a responsible tenant in the building. You know, we've worked on many historic restorations over the last 40 years



here. We won a few awards for our work. Alexander House is one of them. And if there's one axiom I've learned over all the years of doing this kind of work is that if the tenant is thriving, the building is surviving. So what we'd like the Commission to formalize Dr. Albury's business as a special use in Historic District No. 3; not only does this presence provide an early warning system, but, as Stanley pointed out, it provides the church with income in order to its preventative maintenance.

And again, to summarize, we're requesting repair and reconstruction plan approval and formalization of Dr. Albury's tenancy at the Baybrook House. Thank you.

Chair Fredericksen: Thanks, Jim. Any questions for the project architect? I'd also just like to share with the Commission that Jim was on the Commission sometime back. I know him. He's a good guy.

Mr. Niess: That's quite a memory.

Chair Fredericksen: Any questions for Jim?

Ms. Sarich: I have a lot of respect for Jim's work, and this looks great. I just wondered about the doors and windows, are you going to rebuild them?

Mr. Niess: If and when possible. You really can't tell until we pull it apart and see how bad the damage is. And so we're going to do our best to restore but if not, we're going to have to replace.

Ms. Sarich: But with -- are you going to have windows made ...(inaudible)... be able to match?

Mr. Niess: Oh yeah. The appearance will be the same. That's our goal. I mean the real goal is to give this building another 20 or 30 years of healthy life.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Ms. Sarich: And then I had a question about roof line. It said new -- extend of new roof line and --

Mr. Niess: That was from a previous project.

Ms. Sarich: Okay.

Mr. Niess: It's been re-roofed and so -- that's your first line of defense is keep the water out.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Ms. Sarich: And then is the building still eligible for National Historic Register after we add the studs inside?

Mr. Niess: Oh yeah. I believe it is. Yes.

Mr. Osako: I have a question. On the drawings, it appears that, possibly, you're planning on plywood siding because the battens are quite far spaced apart as compared to the old construction?

Mr. Niess: The battens will be exactly the same.

Mr. Osako: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Niess: The battens will be spaced exactly the same.

Mr. Osako: Exactly.

Mr. Niess: Yeah. No. We have no intention of changing the appearance of the building.

Mr. Osako: And the other question I had, on the right side elevation photo, it appears that one window there has been covered up, the sill is still there, but it appeared like there were four windows there.

Mr. Niess: That's right. And that's going to get restored back to its original.

Mr. Osako: So, I don't know, how does that affect the historic --

Chair Fredericksen: Well, it'll be restored back to what it was.

Mr. Osako: So they'll add the fourth window back in?

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Mr. Osako: Okay, 'cause it doesn't appear in the drawings as such.

Chair Fredericksen: So will the window be put back in, Jim, or --

Mr. Niess: That's our intention, yes. I mean it's pretty ugly right now.

Mr. Hutaff: I don't know. It looks good to me. I like the windows.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other questions or comments? Brandis?

Ms. Sarich: I just have a question about Dr. Albury tenancy. Is this against the -- I didn't get to look up the section of the zoning.

Ms. Thomson: It would probably fall under a special use, and the bottom category is other uses that will enhance the historical and cultural nature of this district. But I believe that's not what's before the Commission today, so if they wanted to have that variance granted, that means they'd just come back.

Chair Fredericksen: And I would also add that having a tenant that's there is -- that's part of the adaptive reuse, someone ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Niess: You know, reading the agenda, it does discuss Dr. Albury's use here and business use of the office building so --

Mr. Hutaff: Could we ask --

Mr. Solamillo: Okay, this will be my clerical error. In doing the research after the agenda item was prepared, it may involve a little bit more than just us saying a yay or nay because there has to be some research done. There are a couple ways of interpretation that are really best done by ZAED, and we're not, in this particular instance, we're not -- at least I'm not able to make a recommendation and we shouldn't be making a recommendation without having made the research on which way the proposed use, which is a chiropractic clinic, how that falls within the current uses allowed within that historic district. On the one had, in 19.52.100, under Regulations for Historic District No. 3, B., under Special Uses, "The following uses may be allowed with written approval by the County Historic Commission," which is us, the CRC, "museums, art galleries, and book or gift stores, daycare centers, nurseries, preschools, kindergartens, cultural society clubs or fraternal organizations, off-street parking, provided that none shall abut any street, residential planned developments," and under 6, "other uses that will enhance the historical and cultural nature of this district." In trying to determine whether that was applicable, I raised the question with Current Planning, and response was that the proposed use is not a permitted use nor does it qualify as a special use under that code item and that it might require a conditional use permit. So we were recommended that we need to go to ZAED for a confirmation and bring that back to us at another time.

Chair Fredericksen: So we would be, at this point, looking at --

Mr. Solamillo: Just the rehabilitation.

Chair Fredericksen: The rehab. We're having some conferring behind me here.

Mr. Hutaff: For informational purposes only, can we call up the chiropractor?

Chair Fredericksen: Is this on the agenda? Not really.

Mr. Hutaff: Not really? Not even the pastor? I'm just trying to establish the fact that it would be important to them to restore the building so --

Chair Fredericksen: Well, I'm sure it's important for the landowner and, you know, as a Commission Member, I certainly don't wanna put up a roadblock for adaptive reuse for a cool building that needs help.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah.

Ms. Kanuha: Yeah.

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah, that's why ...(inaudible)... we can put it into the record that we had the conversation.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. That's fine.

Ms. Chandler: I don't have that code in front of me again, but did it mention the Commission approving uses because, apparently, somebody wrote this a long time ago and decided that like daycares and bookstores and, you know, whatever, but --

Chair Fredericksen: We have some discussion going on behind, which, hopefully, we'll get some enlightenment.

Ms. Sarich: Can we move to approve the architectural part?

Ms. Chandler: Yeah, that's what I'm -- well, no, but the question is if you can't be there, would you go through -- I mean -- yeah. They need to be able to be there in order to go through with the ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Let's see what Corp. Counsel has to offer here.

Ms. Chandler: Okay.

Ms. Thomson: So we've, you know, just conferred a bit on this body's authority to grant a special use, and because of the way it was posted today, it's probably best to come back for a request to this body for a special use, which can be approved by the CRC, under it's 19.52.100.B.6. would be the category that it would fall under, so, you know, posting it as an agenda item under that category and requesting that this body act on that request.

Mr. Niess: Could I make a comment?

Chair Fredericksen: Sure.

Mr. Niess: My office is in the Alexander House, which is adjacent to this building, and we do have that particular designation under that clause, so the Commission has already set a precedent for this kind of -- and it's important, obviously, for the church to have an income producing situation here, so we were hoping to get this all cleared up today - one pass. Coming back to the Commission delays the construction project. It's -- you don't always get a quorum. Sometimes you're off-island.

Ms. Thomson: I don't think that the -- there's no reason why you can't act on the construction portion of this today and, you know, save the business use for a subsequent meeting.

Chair Fredericksen: And here's a question for you, Jim. If the construction part of it's approved today, you can go forward with the building permit and everything? No? So what --

Mr. Niess: No. It will get stopped at ZAED.

Chair Fredericksen: Oh, I see. So are we stuck?

Ms. Kanuha: I just wanted to --

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, Makalapua?

Ms. Kanuha: Okay, so -- okay, this building is like right in this district, correct?

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Ms. Kanuha: So Maui Medical is like right across the street.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah --

Ms. Kanuha: Okay, so we talking about health and wellness, la`au lapa`au, and lomi, or -- so I think we should just go through it. I mean she's doing something great that's contributing to health and wellness, and Maui Medical is right across the street. I'm having a problem right now in my mind.

Ms. Chandler: I agree. And it kinda sounds like we all --

Ms. Kanuha: It doesn't --

Ms. Chandler: Agree and --

Ms. Kanuha: Yes.

Ms. Chandler: And we're just kind of at the mercy of how it's written on the agenda as to whether or not we can move forward with it today. But if it does get moved to another date, I mean, I think you're saying that there's a lot of support for it.

Ms. Thomson: Let me clarify something, with the Chair's permission. The advice that I was talking about is a strict reading of that code provision. If and it may, you know, open you up to challenge, which I think is unlikely in this circumstance, but if this body agrees with that, that the posting is adequate, and wants to act on the request for a special use under that section, like I said, it would be less open to challenge if you post it and hear it at a different date, but if this body would like to act on it today, I think that that's within your authority.

Ms. McLean: And, Mr. Chair, if I could close the circle that Stanley mentioned about getting an interpretation from ZAED about the uses, and that's typically how our department works, our Zoning Administration and Enforcement Division clarifies the uses that are outlined in the code. When it comes to this No. 6 though, that's been quoted a couple of times, "Other uses that will enhance the historical and cultural nature of this districts," Richelle and I conferred and we feel like this body well equipped to interpret that provision of the code to say what will enhance the historical and cultural nature of this district, and so if you feel like this falls under that provision, then you can move forward with acting on the request rather than having ZAED say that it falls under that provision.

Chair Fredericksen: Thank you.

Ms. Sarich: I would like us to move forward.

Chair Fredericksen: Yes. Well, let's go ahead and -- Stanley?

Ms. Kanuha: I'm going to need an adjustment after this.

Chair Fredericksen: Oh, thank you. Okay, before we move forward, I was gently reminded that we need to take public testimony on this item, agenda item. Thank you, Stanley. If there's anyone from the public who wants to testify on this matter, item, please come forward, state your name. Okay, no -- let the record reflect that no -- oh, go ahead.

Ms. Nadine Gomes: Hi.

Chair Fredericksen: Good morning.

Ms. Gomes: My name is Nadine Gomes, and I'm the Moderator of Wailuku Union Church, and I've been the Moderator for two years now, and since I've been the Moderator, we have taken great care to take care of our buildings. As you may have just seen in the newspaper, that our sanctuary has just made 100 years old, and we've done that by not changing too much about our buildings. You know, the structure always stays the same. And, you know, we restore, like our stained glass windows, we -- you know, it needed to be repaired but it was repaired in the same fashion. And we look at our properties, our structures as gifts, as blessings that, you know, that we can benefit from but also the community. So I hope that, you know, you support us in this, which sounds like you do, and we greatly appreciate it.

Chair Fredericksen: Thank you. Rhiannon? Oh.

Mr. Rob Kojima: Hi. I'm Rob Kojima. I'm the Pastor of Wailuku Union Church.

Chair Fredericksen: Good morning.

Mr. Kojima: Thank you for being able to address this council. The tenants that we have are very special to us, and we have long relationships with them, and they have benefitted the church in the care of the buildings that they've been using, and they take it upon themselves to do some of the repair themselves because they know that our church is on a limited budget. We have a tremendous amount of buildings that we need to take care of and it's increased because the buildings are old, the buildings are older, and the termites just love them for some reason. And it was until last year, I think, that we were able to put them all on extended termite warranties with Terminix, so that really has helped because now they're on a regular schedule. But it's those kinds of things that, with the help of the Architectural Group and then also with Dr. Albury, and we know that we're being able to continue to be stewards of the buildings and the properties that we have. And so I just wanted to speak in favor of her business, and what she was doing, and the use of the building, and that it -- on the other hand, it has very low impact on the grounds and also on the building, but it has a big impact on us in order for us to continue to be feasible and to maintain the facilities that we have.

Chair Fredericksen: Thank you. It's about adaptive reuse. We have one more. Did you have a --

Ms. Chander: Chair?

Mr. Lester Kuloloio: Aloha mai. Lester Kuloloio. I just came here unexpectedly, but I think I'm supporting the -- I wanna say I wanna support the historic district and the works of our

churches here in our Wailuku District. I've been involved many years ago with the old timers, all hala already, in the early '60s and '70s, when the first historic district came up in Lahaina. And then Wailuku came. One of the things why I'm supporting this project, especially hale . . . Kaahumanu Church, the board of health state buildings, the judge courthouse, this building, it's all centralized in one area that was full at that time. Windows can be changed. Sometimes termites gotta leave. And I just wanted to say I support the Good Faith, that -- the churches come up because I dealt with the centennial celebration of the Hawaiian churches here in the early '70s and we tried to put together the history of our Christian adaption to Hawai'i. But now, that adaption has turn into being Hawaiian Christians rather than Christians. So together, working together, I'd like to see consideration to support, especially when you see a house like this, those houses, especially in that area, is very old, and the termites are singing *Hawai'i Aloha*.

Ms. Kanuha: Holding hands.

Mr. Kuloloio: And so I'm supporting this project because I don't know, sometimes rules say something but it's hard to condition to facilitate a situation like this, but I support the church for they keeping it alive, the doors opening. I support the church because the kept and maintained under strict rules of preservation buildings over 50 years. And times is good, but that law can be your bad enemy when it comes to maintaining and cost, and we faced it in our Hawaiian churches. So I support them anyway. This Commission can give them one new, not Facebook, but one new look with the law and be considerate and put the kind conditions that bottom line is they continue to help the kinda job that you're doing maintain the continuous history of Maui in that area, the historic district, and with your folks' help, continue so that anytime our generations want history, they just can flip the page and they can go direct to the past. Mahalo. Thank you.

Chair Fredericksen: Thanks, Uncle Les.

Ms. Kanuha: Mahalo nui.

Chair Fredericksen: Oh, we have another --

Mr. Hinano Rodrigues: Aloha mai kakou. I'm not speaking on behalf of historic preservation. I'm speaking personally. My mother is the moderator for Olowalu Church --

Chair Fredericksen: And you are?

Mr. Rodrigues: And I'm Hinano Rodrigues, and I serve as the advisor to the Olowalu Church and, therefore, I think I can speak on behalf of the church. Olowalu Church would also like to support our sister church, Wailuku Union. We're all United Church of Christ. And I think it's -- I support them moreso because I think it's a church's right to decide what



they want, and I, to take it a wider extent, I agree with Makalapua that this woman here is providing healthcare. You know, it's not as though she's opening up a bar on that property. It's healthcare. It's all a part of cultural and all that kinda stuff. So, on the record, Olowalu Church supports Wailuku Union Church in their furtherance of improving their property.

Chair Fredericksen: Thanks, Hinano. Okay, now if there's no other public testimony, we'll close public testimony, and then, Rhiannon, you had a comment.

Ms. Chandler: No, I just wanted to say thank you to the Deputy Director and Corporation Counsel for trying to save us because we want to move forward on something but we always can't just rush rush, sometimes we have to follow. So I think we wanna find ways to work within our process to make these kinda good things happen. Thank you.

Chair Fredericksen: And, along that comment, Corp. Counsel has indicated that we'll need to have two motions. The first one, if the Commission so chooses, would be a motion, basically, on the certificate of approval for the actual building permit itself, as was presented. And then the second motion would be to have the operation of a chiropractic clinic as approved under special use section, and we can get to that in a minute. So let's -- if there's no more discussion other than, I mean it's adaptive reuse, and I've seen the building many times and it does need some help, but it is -- it has been maintained well; it's just ground termites are pretty bad. But so if one of the Commission Members wants to put forth the first motion, which is -- would be something along this lines of approving the building permit itself.

Ms. Chandler: Alright. So the first motion would be that we approve the certificate of approval for building permit.

Mr. Osako: Second.

Chair Fredericksen: And this is about them being able to do the necessary repairs and reconstruction but keeping ...(inaudible)... is there a second? Ok, seconded. Okay.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

***It has been moved by Ms. Chandler, seconded by Mr. Osako, then unanimously***

***VOTED: to approve the certificate of approval for building permit.***

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. That motion carries. Now, the second motion.

Mr. Hutaff: Second motion, I move that we recognize and approve the chiropractic business as being low impact, high value to that area and allow them to continue.

Chair Fredericksen: And there's a section that's referenced.

Mr. Hutaff: Reference to section 19.52.100.B.6. So I recommend its low impact be covered under that.

Ms. Kanuha: And I second.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

***It has been moved by Mr. Hutaff, seconded by Ms. Kanuha, then unanimously***

***VOTED: that the CRC recognize and approve the chiropractic business as being low impact, high value to that area and allow them to continue and that it be covered under Section 19.52.100.B.6.***

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. I just would like to thank the folks for coming forward, and it's a really neat building, and smooth sailing.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. And then, Chair, I have a question.

Chair Fredericksen: Yes?

Ms. Chandler: Is it possible to add "wellness" as a use in the future? How would we go about changing the code? I mean I know that it's an involved process, but that would make sense.

Ms. Thomson: Sure. You know, this body can suggest additional special uses that are allowed under that code section if you wanted to specify, you know, more specific ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: It's really a good point. It's something, definitely, that we should revisit. Stanley, next -- okay, we're going to take a five-minute break, everybody, and then we'll resume.

*(A recess was called at 11:30 a.m., and the meeting was reconvened at 11:40 a.m.)*

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, I'd like to reconvene the February 2, 2012 meeting of the Cultural Resources Commission. And where are we? Item E.

*Mr. Solamillo read the following item description into the record:*

## **E. DEMOLITIONS**

- 1. MR. ROBERT E. FREEBURG, AIA, on behalf of the STATE OF HAWAI'I, DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES, requesting comments and recommendations on the demolition of the OLD JUDICIARY BUILDING, located at Makaena Place, TMK 5-3-005:012, Kaunakakai, Island of Moloka'i, Hawai'i. The CRC may provide comments and recommendations. Public testimony will be accepted. *This item was deferred by the CRC on January 5, 2012. (S. Solamillo)***

Mr. Solamillo: This is a remnant building that, in the oral traditional, it was first built in Puko`o in the 1800s and that has yet to be confirmed. It was located on the edge of a fishpond at Puko`o Harbor, and this was shown on an 1882 map that prepared by the Hawaiian Government Survey by W.D. Alexander. The inset of the right shows the courthouse and the jail. In 1888, another map was shown, this was prepared by Montserrat, and showed the two buildings. List of Second Circuit Court judges from 1887 through 1918, which is the most intact chronology that we have, and include: Abraham Fornander; A. Noah Kapoikai; John W. Kalua; A. Noi Kapoikai again; Selden B. Kingsbury; William S. Edings; and after that, the courthouse and jail were moved to Ualapu`e, and then finally to Kaunakakai.

The only Sanborn that we located was one from 1927. This one was prepared by the New York Sanborn Insurance Company, drawn in 1927 and revised in 1945, and it shows a long telescoping plan, which was the courthouse plus additions, and this remnant building is one of those additions that was tacked on to the end of the courthouse proper. Although the jail does not appear on this particular Sanborn map, it does appear in a photograph. This one's taken in 1937, and it is an Armistice Day Parade. Armistice Day was celebrated after World War I. And this shows the courthouse on the government parcel. And just to the right of the flag, in front of the courthouse, you can barely see the jail behind it.

Other photographs were taken at various times; 1973 and 1988. And it's really interesting that this was the seat of the Second Circuit Court. In 1988, this is what the entire complex courthouse, and then buildings attached to it, looked like. And this is the remnant building we're talking about. It was cut. And then a section to the right of dash line was removed. And then the remnant building was used as offices. And that's the way it looks today. These are additional views, such as the remnant building on the top photograph, the bottom photograph, the one and one-half story high building is the actual courthouse building. And this is the interior of the courtroom.

What makes this kind of important is that this courtroom was the courtroom of the first Asian-American woman judge in the Territory of Hawai`i as well as the State of Hawai`i, and that was Judge Marybeth Yuen Maul, and she lived from 1925 and passed away in 2010, and she is a Moloka`i daughter. She is the daughter of Moloka`i merchant, Y.K. Yuen. Marybeth Yuen Maul was born at Maunaloa, and she is the youngest of all of all the children, and she was born in 1925. She was the daughter of Y.K. Yuen and Lin Tai Chock. She attended Punahou School, in Honolulu; graduated with a degree in law from University of Wisconsin; clerked for two years in Chicago, Illinois; negotiated the pineapple workers strike in Hawai`i in 1947; was engaged in private law practice on Moloka`i; and joined the Second Circuit Court as Magistrate from 1957 to 1971. As I mentioned earlier, she is the first Asian-American female magistrate in the Territory of Hawai`i and the State of Hawai`i. She was a recipient of the Keepers of the Flame Award from the Hawai`i Immigrant Justice Center in 1988. She co-founded the Moloka`i Humane Society. She assisted Big Brothers and Big Sisters programs and the Girl Scouts on Moloka`i. She served on the Hawai`i State Advisory Committee for the Department of Education on Title IV. And retired as the administrative for the Kalaupapa Settlement in 1992. And I'm sure that this is all an oversight when we look at things that have happened up to this point.

Her father, Yun Kee, or Y.K., Yuen, was -- lived from 1898 to 1963. He was born in Manoa in 1898. He was the son of Fong Yuk Yuen and Chun Shee Yuen. They came from Chung Shan District in China. He was given the family name of "Akana." He attended the Royal School in Honolulu; worked for Libby, McNeil & Libby as an office clerk and bookkeeper; operated Y.K. Yuen Company Store in Maunaloa; hired native Hawaiians, Filipinos, Japanese, Okinawans, Chinese, Portuguese, and Anglos as sales clerks. He married Lin Tai Chock and raised four children: Lilyan, Jane, Marybeth, and John. He established Central Store, at Ho`olehua, which served the first group of native Hawaiians on Hawaiian homestead lands. He operated Moloka`i Market located in Kaunakakai. He acquired Kualapu`u Market, located in the CPC, or California Packing Corporation, pineapple plantation at Kualapu`u. Spent the last two decades of his life living at Keawanui Fishpond on Moloka`i's east end, and that fishpond was built circa 1500, and that was the one that we visited when we were on Moloka`i.

So this is going to be related to two other buildings, which will come in under Correspondence, and you all have been given the background report as well as been given an evaluation report that's been prepared by Glen Mason, or Mason Architects. In fact, Glen is here if you have any questions for him, you can address them to him now.

Chair Fredericksen: Thank you, Stanley.

Mr. David Victor: My name is David Victor. I'm the Maui District Engineer for the Department of Accounting and General Services. I'll refer to Department of Accounting and General Services as DAGS from here on after. I'd like to clarify something in the agenda.

Mr. Robert E. Freeburg is listed and he's our architect who is preparing the plans and specs to demolish the building, and that's the project that's before us today to demolish that building at Kaunakakai Civic Center. It's currently abandoned. It has been abandoned for quite a few years, maybe eight, nine years, since the employee who was using it retired. It's in, structurally, in poor condition due to age and termite damage. Additionally, we've had our environmental consultant, environmental -- Muranaka Environmental Consultants do a hazardous materials survey of the building, and what they found is the roof contained asbestos, not just the roofing paper, but the roofing mastic contains asbestos. The paint contains lead. The fiber board inside the building, it's normally -- I guess a common term is . . . the fiberboard contains asbestos -- I'm sorry, arsenic. The fiberboard contains arsenic. The light fixtures contain PCBs, and the fluorescent lights contain mercury. One of the problems is that the building is falling apart. The roof material containing asbestos is flying all over the place. The paint is blistered and peeling so lead chips are falling on the ground and blowing around. And it's, basically, just an eyesore, yeah. So we propose to demolish the building and Glen Mason, of Mason Architects, will speak about the historical and cultural aspects of the building.

Chair Fredericksen: Thank you.

Mr. Glen Mason: Hi. I'm Glen Mason, with Mason Architects. And I think -- let me state that we were hired first by DAGS to -- well, actually, we were hired by Bob Freeburg, who was hired by DAGS, to make a determination as to whether we thought this particular building was -- was it eligible for the register, because that's one of the -- I mean that's the first threshold we have to pass, we have to cover. And in summary, we've decided that it doesn't, and I don't think there's any question about this. This was -- this is a piece of an addition to the courthouse, which was also associated with the jail, and I'm not going to -- I, you know, did the adaptive reuse of the Wailuku Courthouse and I worked on the Lahaina Courthouse, it is -- goes without saying that courthouses are really important parts of the communities that they're in. I mean they are almost a lightning rod for things that happened in communities. So there is no contention about whether or not the Kaunakakai courthouse and jail complex was important. The problem is is that according to the National Register criteria, moved buildings almost automatically lose their eligibility for the register. And, of course, not only were large portions of this complex moved, but half of this linear building was removed and demolished. So you have a real integrity problem here, and I don't think that if this was sent to the keeper, this would ever be indicated as eligible for the register.

Now, that being said, this whole issue is complicated by the fact that you have these pieces now all over the place on Moloka'i, and, you know, the issue is what you do with them. And I think the letter that is, you know, which maybe we can talk about later, is raising those issues, even though any building can be interpreted, but from the strictly is this a historic building that we're talking about here? The answer is no. And, you know, the mistake was

made 18 or 19 years ago. It shouldn't have been split up. It shouldn't have been moved we could argue, but it's a done deal, and we're stuck with what we have today so -- if you got any question about it, let me know.

Chair Fredericksen: Any questions or comments for the project architect?

Mr. Mason: Well, I'm not the project architect. I'm just -- we did the research, and we only did the historic evaluation.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Gotcha.

Mr. Mason: Yeah. Right.

Chair Fredericksen: Gotcha.

Mr. Mason: But Bob asked me to come in his place because he didn't feel comfortable answering any questions that were likely to come from the Cultural Commission so --

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. You mentioned the one -- the other, I don't know, if you would call it "the other half," but the rest of the -- of that linear building was demolished?

Mr. Mason: Well, actually -- yeah, put up that 1988 photo ...(inaudible)...

Ms. McLean: Can you, excuse me? Do we have the portable mike so this can be recorded?

Mr. Mason: I pointed to a place on the building that would indicate that nearly one-half of that addition is gone. I would guess that's almost 20 feet.

Chair Fredericksen: And then when you say "gone," it's been demolished?

Mr. Mason: It's been demolished.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay.

Mr. Mason: Now, frankly, when we got into this, we were looking at integrity, and so there's all sorts of wonderful history about these buildings.

Chair Fredericksen: Sure.

Mr. Mason: That hasn't been recorded in what we were looking at, but the dead giveaway is that when you look underneath the building, one of the reasons why it's collapsing at that

one end or it looks like it's collapsing, is that they cutoff of the joist about this far from one of the support beams, and, literally, that wall that used to be, you know, on the courthouse side, is hanging there. There is no support. And if you look at them, they're just these little stubs of joist that are about this long hanging off of the beam with no support on this one end. What's holding it up is the wall itself. And so I mean it was just a crude hack job that they did in, I guess, '92 or '93.

Chair Fredericksen: Brandis? You're still mauling things over?

Ms. Sarich: Yeah. I just kinda lumped all three buildings together in all of my thinking so now I'm trying to separate out just this one portion. Does this portion have any architectural features that are very unique to Hawai'i or to this type of building? Are there any details inside or --

Mr. Mason: No. I mean if you ask me that about the jail, I would say oh yeah. You know, the jail's a really cool building. And the courthouse is got some interesting characteristics. This -- even -- and if you look at the old maps that Stanley showed, it's clear that this addition that we're talking about was not there in the beginning, but it was there by '27, so we don't even know when this was built. It's a single-wall building. In looking at it, it's been fiddled around with a little bit on the inside so that you can see some places where it's been -- they've gone double-wall and some places it's single-wall, but it's a fairly typical single-wall building. What makes this or what made this important was its association with the courthouse. I mean the jail is kind of a unique building from a materials and construction point of view, and so that might even be eligible on that basis. But I think what really makes these buildings -- what made these buildings stand out is the association of the use, the use that it had been put to. But this particular building, I wouldn't say that it had any particular distinguishing characteristics. The biggest problem it has is most of it's gone and, you know, it doesn't tell the story. If you'd left it there, if you preserved it there, it still wouldn't tell the story of what the most important things were that were there, which is the courthouse. This was an ancillary building that supported the courthouse, and the courthouse is gone or, you know, moved to another site. So that's the real problem you have there.

Ms. Sarich: And can the -- if we can find a way to save the courthouse, can the courthouse's story be told well without this attachment to it?

Mr. Mason: Well, because the courthouse existed without this for some period of time, you could make that argument. If we were living in an ideal world, it would be great to have everything put back together again, but, remember, what you would be doing is doing a reconstruction. Now, it's still -- reconstructions give you an opportunity to do interpretation as well. I mean we did in a -- our office did a kitchen reconstruction to Hulihe'e Palace, for example, but we had really good documentation of what that used to look like. This is a

little different because every part of this would then be -- would then be moved, if this in fact got moved, and then you would still be building a reconstruction. I mean not to jump ahead, but the challenge is who's going to do it and, you know, where does it go, and all of those unanswered questions.

Chair Fredericksen: Warren, did you have a -- no?

Ms. Sarich: I just have a question for Stanley. Do you feel that this remnant building carries importance because of its association with the judge in the Second Circuit Court? Or do you feel that the courthouse is what carries that association?

Mr. Solamillo: It's like cutting chickens or cutting sheep. The courthouse can stand by itself. This building cannot stand by itself. The only function that I would probably recommend in a perfect world is that we reassemble this with the courthouse to its original or its most late plan, which was -- which we saw in 1988 of the 1927 building, but that's a reconstruction.

Ms. Sarich: Okay.

Mr. Solamillo: I think my concern is is about what I'm seeing is a pattern on how the resources of Kaunakakai are being handled, and it's kind of being mirrored in other place, and we'll have opportunity to discuss that, but this seems to be -- that's what's most disturbing.

Ms. Sarich: Thank you.

Ms. Chandler: Chair? And this is not for you or the architect, this is more for DAGS. It's actually really disturbing to hear about paint flying and the roof falling apart because that's what happens to old buildings when you don't take care of them, and I know that there's every reason that we've ever heard every time that somebody comes up and says this building has to be demolished, but there's a state function for preservation and it's astonishing that they can't find a state entity when they cut a building in half and don't even leave a support beam behind, you know. So I think this is a really exceptional case of intentional degradation and I think if you're aware of the people that did this, I think that somehow this has to be addressed, and I'm sure we can't within our function even go there, but I think it's just really disappointing, and a building that was built that long ago, when there's so few left, there's no amount of justification for why we have to destroy something that was preventative and that's, I think, the sad thing that probably Stan sees more than any of us here. But my question is actually -- well, my statement about this building is that I think it's beyond saving, and we've already lost half of it, so I don't know what we're going to do at this point in time. The courthouse, my question is: Did it come from here? It's a



different agenda item, but did it come from this location and what is going to be on this location after this building is torn down? I guess that's my question.

Mr. Victor: If the building is torn down, it'll be just grassed over. It's a small building. The square footage is approximately 400 feet -- square feet.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. We saw it.

Mr. Victor: So it's not anything that we think is significant, yeah. So, yeah, it'll be grassed over. Let me kinda give you some of the history that I know, I don't know a whole lot, but what happened back in '93 or '94 is that the new phase two of Kaunakakai State Office Building was constructed, and the people who were -- the employees who were using this building, and whatever was moved or destroyed, were supposed to move into the new Kaunakakai State Office Building too. So what happened, there was one employee who refused to move. If it weren't for her, the whole building would have been down where the other -- where the courthouse is, but provisions were made to accommodate that employee and the building was cut in half and that one employee was allowed to remain in this building while everybody else moved into the new Kaunakakai State Office Building. So that's kinda the history, you know, why that employee was allowed to stay in this building and the way the building was hacked and probably not reconstructed properly. I don't know. Yeah. But I think that's as much as I know about the history.

Ms. Chandler: Is this understood to be the original site of the courthouse complex or was it moved here?

Mr. Victor: I think Stanley mentioned in his presentation that it was -- maybe, Stanley, you could kind of clarify where the building originally --

Mr. Solamillo: Alright, if we look at the pieces of the Sanborn Insurance Map, you know where the library is now? Okay, that's -- if you look at the red arrow at the right, upper right-hand corner, the building to left of the red arrow is the library, okay. So what will have happened is that in 1937, when this other shot was taken right here, right? The courthouse is very close to the street, okay. Alright, what happens after it is moved is that what remains of the courthouse is actually rotated so that it now faces the library, okay, that's actually moved closer to the library. So it's actually been cut and moved on that original government parcel. So even as far as an integrity issue, is it on its original site? No. So it too has been moved. So this is a remnant building on a -- which has been relocated within the original government parcel itself.

Ms. Chandler: What I was wondering was the building that that Malama Cultural Park, from the testimony that we heard on Moloka'i, cannot stay there long term and they were looking

for a location, I was wondering if this place where we're taking this building down, if this was even near to the original site, could be a house?

Mr. Solamillo: Well, that's probably something I was intending to go into. There was a flurry of activity after that meeting. Arleone Dibben-Young contacted the governor's liaison on Moloka'i, and asked for her assistance, and there was information which was passed to the governor's office, also to Senator Inouye's office, and Senator Akaka's office as well. I received calls yesterday. Did I hear anything from anybody? No. So at after the 11<sup>th</sup> hour, we have nothing in writing, we have nothing at all, so I have nothing to bring to this Commission at this time so --

Ms. Chandler: I'm sorry. Regarding this building or the courthouse?

Mr. Solamillo: Regarding any of the above.

Ms. Chandler: Okay.

Mr. Solamillo: So --

Mr. Mason: I was talking to Walter Kobayashi at the -- at DAGS about this because that letter kind of raised a few issues, and the only thing that I can say is that DAGS is looking into -- I mean it's really kind of even unclear as to who owns the property that these current remnants are sitting on 'cause the letter indicated or, you know, your letter indicated that one of them sits on county land, one sits on DLNR land, and they think that might be right but they're not sure because there's no survey to show where these things really sit. There's also no record of ownership; in other words, when these buildings were moved, who owned them when they were moved. Remember, they used to be owned by the judiciary, which is a different branch of government, and then one of them apparently was put on county land, and another one was put on DLNR land, and it's like -- it's really a confusing mess right now, and DAGS is trying to figure it out. They're in the process of, you know, they've got some of their planners trying to figure out exactly where it is, and what happened, and how it happened, and it's kind of amazing that we're talking about this 18 years after it happened, but that's, you know, the world we're living in I guess.

Chair Fredericksen: Thank you.

Mr. Hutaff: Actually, if you look at how the buildings are placed at Malama Park, you can understand how it happened. It just has to do with how they loaded it onto a truck and how they unloaded it onto the truck. That's all. Okay. One went one way because of the truck; the other one couldn't do the same thing so it went the other way. But this building that we're talking about now, it was used as an accessory to the courthouse and the jail as far as record filing and record keeping. Am I correct? So it was built specifically to support the

jail and the courthouse. Am I correct? Okay. As far as the issue of moving a building goes, I get the fact that there's some paperwork out there that says, okay, if you move a building from its site, that, therefore, it has less value or less historical value, possibly. But then that would be like saying, well, because I was born in North Carolina, and I moved to Koko Head, therefore, there's no value for me being born in North Carolina. There's still a value of what the building was built for and where -- regardless of where its moved to, in my opinion, and --

Mr. Mason: Well, I understand that, but we're talking about National Register Criteria that I mean --

Mr. Hutaff: I'm not.

Mr. Mason: Well, I know you're not, but I'm just saying --

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah. I'm looking at it from a strict point of view that here is a building that has historic significance for the island of Moloka'i, regardless of whether it's in North Carolina today or anywhere else, it has historical significance. The fact that it still resides in Moloka'i and it was moved, you know, for me, personally, I get the law, okay, I understand what you're talking about rehabilitation and, you know, is it going to be subject to approval for funds and stuff like that, I'm disregarding that as an argument only because my argument is this is a building that has historical value. It doesn't matter where it is. Okay, yes, I understand if it was in the same place, we wouldn't have this. It wouldn't be an argument, okay? But it doesn't really matter. Regardless of where you put this building, it has historical value to Moloka'i. If you look at the people, the judges, who were there, those are real cultural identities that identify with this building. Taking that alone, to me, means it's worth preserving. As far as the additional building goes, my only -- I can see both sides, and I'm certainly split half-and-half on it, our problem is if you say, okay, this one doesn't have any value, I don't believe that that's really the case because who decides what's historical or not? You know, if we sit here and decide that that's not historical, then one day someone's going to decide for us what our history is. And so preserving it should be paramount; understanding that, yes, that's going to have to be rebuilt, not restored, but definitely the other two buildings are very, very important regardless of what this says. And that's just my opinion.

Mr. Mason: Well, you know, it's hard to argue with the fact that those building has incredible interpretive potential, okay. The National Register Criteria is pretty clear about how you treat those buildings. Now, it doesn't say that no moved building can ever be considered historic. I mean, for example, if you manage to restore the jail, and you manage to restore the courthouse, and, you know, maybe even reconstruct certain parts of it, you would probably have to make a reevaluation at that time, but under the circumstances, you do not have a historic building, okay. It doesn't mean that it doesn't

have any value; it just means that it doesn't meet the register criteria for a historic building, okay. And, you know, I think they have value. I, personally, think Moloka'i needs to keep as many things as it can possibly keep because that's one of the problems on Moloka'i. But that doesn't change the reality of the fact that this is lost and this -- this building, what we're talking about right here, has lost integrity. It doesn't change it.

Mr. Hutaff: To the law or and to the book and to the historic -- to me, it hasn't lost ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Mason: But you have to have integrity criteria, or there is no -- that means that when you sit and you judge a building, like you just did, which was a no-brainer, a really good project up by the church, if you have no integrity criteria, then why do you ask them about the batten spacing? Why do you care what the exterior is? Why don't you just let them put horizontal siding on it? Integrity matters. And integrity is why we hold people's feet to the fire when we ask them to restore things. Integrity matters, okay. We have a problem here. This problem was 18 years ago. Frankly, it was a big problem. We could argue it shouldn't have been done. We can talk about what the possible solutions are to that. But it does not change the reality that this has lost integrity.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. Well stated. And that's -- that's the, you know, the crux of the matter is we've got this portion of a building that was previously removed, and then it was made a portion, and it's just basically a mess. And, Stanley, a question for you. So as of right now, no one has come forth with a here's a piece of property, and we're going to restore this, and everything's good, correct?

Mr. Solamillo: We have discussions. We have emails and materials, which have been sent to various offices. We do not have any concrete proposal in writing before us today.

Chair Fredericksen: Has there been any response to the emails that have been sent out or is it just a one-way?

Mr. Solamillo: There has verbal response, as I understand it, but I have nothing in writing. Okay, the issue of integrity, which Mr. Mason brought up, is important because if you want to seek funding or is any of those funding mechanisms that we talk about from time to time the key to all of that is National Register eligibility.

Chair Fredericksen: So, at this point, we're stuck with we have a portion of a building that, you know, doesn't meet any of the National Register requirements because of the integrity issue. It certainly --

Mr. Solamillo: It's important for local history.

Chair Fredericksen: Important for the local history. But in terms of the nuts and bolts, there's -- there isn't a solution for what to do with the building. I mean, yeah, it does have local significance, but there's no -- no one has stepped -- come forth and said we will deal with it. Correct?

Mr. Solamillo: A person has stepped forth but that person doesn't have the funding to do this, and I think the question was -- was made by someone yesterday, well, why doesn't the county take it, and we're not empowered to do that 'cause we, too, have financial challenges at this time. So what are we left with is, okay, we're going to move the building to an unknown site where it will sit again for another ten years; until this time, it falls from the termites.

Chair Fredericksen: Warren?

Mr. Osako: Stanley, I have a question. Does the courthouse have standalone value as far as registry without this part of the building?

Mr. Solamillo: It's been moved. See, this is the whole thing. So, literally, I think from time to time we've talked about we still have that additional opportunity to amend our code to say we have buildings of local significance, which do not meet the National Register Criteria, you know. These are one of those candidates. We have no place to put them. And that -- being as that may, we still have the issue of the other buildings.

Mr. Osako: So would it be more possible that courthouse could be saved without worrying about this part of the building?

Mr. Solamillo: I think as far as an individual building that stood by itself for a time, and these buildings were added to it, that it has its own, you know, it's own history, yes. And the courthouse, I believe is the actual courtroom where Judge Maul held second district court, okay. And then we have the additional thing of Japanese internees. Anybody who was arraigned is arraigned in that courthouse before being put in jail.

Chair Fredericksen: I've got a question for Mr. Victor, if you could come back up. Let's say there's a demolition permit approved, and in the interim, how long does that take, typically?

Mr. Victor: I think a couple of months maybe.

Chair Fredericksen: What would happen if the state had a demolition permit, if DAGS had a demolition permit in hand, and then there was a solution found, in that intervening time, where this building could be placed, would DAGS just go no and then just go ahead with the demolition, or go, if the folks, whoever's doing it, moves it, takes it someplace else?

Mr. Victor: I probably wouldn't be the person to say -- to give you a final yes or no. I'm sure they'd consider it. What has happened now is an offer has been made in writing to the county --

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. I think I saw that.

Mr. Victor: To take the building in its existing condition, yeah, and we'd probably make the same offer to anybody else who would want it. But I think, realistically speaking, you know, for somebody to come out of the blue and say, eh, give me that termite-eaten building with all these hazardous material in it is -- it's kinda farfetched, especially because the jail and the courthouse has been sitting there on the vacant land for almost 20 years, you know. If you consider all three buildings, this building is probably the least significant, and the two other buildings have been there for almost 20 years with no action taken, so, you know, the possibility of somebody saying, yeah, give me this deteriorated termite-eaten hazardous material building, you know, and I'll take it off your hands, is kinda, you know, not that realistic. But if it were to happen, I think we'd strongly consider it.

Chair Fredericksen: The Deputy Director wants to say something.

Ms. McLean: Thank you, Chair. I know that the Director of Public Works is waiting for the outcome of this meeting before finalizing his response to that letter. He asked about the result of the meeting on Moloka'i and was aware that it was deferred to today. I think it's reasonable to say that if the Commission were to move forward with consenting to the demolition but with the term that if prior to physical demolition, someone does come forward to save the building, that the county would strongly encourage that DAGS allow that alternative to run its course. So it would be a request from -- a response to that letter back to DAGS reflecting what this Commission says.

Chair Fredericksen: Thoughts, Brandis?

Ms. Sarich: Yeah. I mean I would just like to support Rhiannon's statement about kind of the pattern and that even though this building may not be that important, it does represent a pattern that is really unacceptable. And the fact that there's lead paint flying and asbestos blowing is really frustrating. Like why isn't any maintenance done? Why can't anything be done? I think that when you look at buildings, and I'm addressing all three buildings here, I mean rewriting history is something that happens, and when you have the physical evidence of what went on, it's a lot harder to do that. And things like the Japanese internment are important enough to really hang on to these structures, you know, to see that a member of the community was actually locked in this humiliating humble little jail, really brings it home what happened during that time. And that's just one example of what went on with these buildings. So I just really worry about destroying kind of this physical evidence of a time and just to see that it's okay for this to happen, and I don't understand

if we have any power or any way to stop this pattern and to force these buildings to be maintained to some level, not the museum that we're all hoping happens, but just so that they aren't a public safety hazard, I mean the bees in the jail is crazy, and that doesn't seem like that's a million dollar proposal to make that safe. You know, there is that woman who spoke up on Moloka`i, and she really wants to try to put this together, and that alone to me means that we should fight for them because there are people on Moloka`i who care about them, and it's not just us over here saying, oh, you should keep it.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. I agree. I think that that's one of the most moving and sad things about this process is that, usually, when people wanna demolish a building, there's nobody here to say anything to contrary, but, in this case, we heard public testimony from residence on Moloka`i that did not want this to happen and how do you look them, you know, in the face and say, yeah, we let them approve it. So it's a really difficult call and if what you're suggesting, Deputy Director, that if this moves forward, there's still the possibility or we should leave a loophole for a possibility if the building could be moved in the meantime, you know, I don't -- I don't know.

Ms. McLean: I don't -- I didn't mean to push that opinion of the Commission.

Ms. Chandler: Oh no.

Ms. McLean: Essentially, whatever the Commission decides for this, we will convey that to the Public Works Department.

Mr. Hutaff: The way I kinda look at it is if -- if we go, okay, too bad-so sad, tear it down. It'll be gone. We'll all forget about it. Okay. And it'll have really no consequence in 25 years. If we figured out a way or if somebody figured out a way to marry the buildings back together, and put it someplace, a hundred years from now, somebody will say, what a great idea it was to keep this historic buildings and its stories together. Those are two perfect ends. The middle one is, okay, and I never thought I'd hear myself say this, but I would really rather see it deteriorate in place, okay, with the hope that someone would come along and go why are we letting it deteriorate in place, if we're asking the question today, okay, and do something about it, okay, because that's hope. Saying, sorry. Not worth it. Take it. Has its consequence and its finality. Anything other than that has hope, and I kinda believe in hope.

Ms. Kanuha: I know we had, while we were on Moloka`i, we had that one woman that was wanting to save that building, however, we did have other Moloka`i residents that was just wanting to get rid of this building, and I totally understand the historical significance of it, and it is, it's very sad that this is the pattern that's not only on Moloka`i, but all over Hawai`i. And as Commissioners, our kuleana is to protect and preserve all these -- the stories that come with building. I mean even if the building is gone, the story's always live on because

we're all still here and that's how we preserve our history as well is the mo`olelo, which is the story. My concern is the safety issue of it. We could just let it deteriorate on its own. Let it fall apart. Somebody gets hurt. Who's responsible for the well-being of the community and the safety? And when I'm hearing that there is asbestos and mercury and if we were to -- if this building is going to be demolished, how are they going to prevent all of that from being airborne? Because if you demolish something, dust, everything just goes up in the air. How do we protect the people who live on Moloka`i from all that so-called "hazardous materials?"

Mr. Hutaff: There are methods.

Ms. Kanuha: You know, I hear about buildings, we still have our historical Pioneer -- that office that's still standing on Lahainaluna, I pass it everyday, and that building's got asbestos in it too. I mean it's still standing there.

Chair Fredericksen: I've got a question for Stanley. Oh, we're still public --

Mr. Solamillo: You have to have public comment.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Well, let's go ahead and take public comment or see if there's any public comment at this point. Okay, we'll close the public comment section now at this point. Stanley, addressing this letter or just reading this letter, so the building's been offered to the County of Maui? What's the county's -- there's been just no response?

Mr. Solamillo: I'm not empowered to answer for the county.

Ms. McLean: As I mentioned, the Public Works Director is waiting to hear what the Commission has to say. The Public Works Department doesn't have a use for it. They're not aware of any county use, so they're inclined to just say no thank you, but they're waiting for the input of this Commission before doing so.

Chair Fredericksen: Does Public Works have access to any vacant land, county land, on Moloka`i if there were some ongoing discussions from a community group, they wanted to get this building some -- I mean resurrected that it could be put there?

Ms. McLean: I don't know.

Ms. Sarich: I don't understand how we could make a decision knowing that there's something pending but we don't know what it is.

Chair Fredericksen: Warren?



Mr. Osako: Don't get me wrong. I like to preserve old buildings and things, but, you know, if nothing moves, I think there should be a time line where, you know, we have to do something. If nothing moves, you know, I think everybody has the idea, well, the county or the state, or the government, somehow should pay for this but, you know, realistically, that means we pay for it. So unless somebody steps up forward with a plan, I think there should be a time line where there should be approval for demolition.

*(Commissioner Chandler stepped out of the meeting at 12:36 p.m.)*

Ms. Sarich: Does a year sound reasonable?

Mr. Hutaff: ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Sarich: Just for the remnant building.

Mr. Osako: Well, you know, I know it's part of like, you know, things that have been happening, but what happens is then the building sits there and becomes more hazardous to the public and the liability is there also, so I mean, you know, I think, you know, and I think that was one of the comments, especially about the old jail being at the park is, you know, it's hazardous now and who becomes liable if anything, if somebody gets injured or stuff, you know. So I think a year is pushing it, you know. At least they gotta have some sort of plan, not, oh, maybe somebody will step forward and give us land and money to do this, you know; that could go on for, like they said, it's been -- the stuff at the park's been there 20 years now, you know.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. I'm -- and I agree with what Warren's saying. The one thing I will say though is that meeting we had on Moloka'i was January whatever, 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup>, okay. This letter was written the middle of December. We didn't have this letter at that point. Did we? We did? Okay. So the first time -- that was the first time the folks on Moloka'i, well, officially, knew what was coming to pass, sort of speak, and that's not an awful lot of time to organize something in response, and I think that's what we've run up against. The calls, or whatever, that were made after the meeting, that's a month, basically, between then and now, not quite a month, but it's -- of the buildings that are coming up on Moloka'i, this, to me, is the least, in terms of picking battles. It's just not -- it's cut in half. Most of it was or half of it was demolished. The jailhouse and the courthouse are a different story. So I'm kind of somewhat ambivalent about it. I think that the time element for being able to -- people being put on the notice and say, okay, this is going to be gone has not been maybe as long as it could be, but also going back to what Warren says, it's like it can't just kinda be something that's open ...(inaudible)... cause it's just not realistic and, as we've been made aware, there are some health issues. I'm assuming the state knew about this before; they didn't. It sat for 18 years. How come? But that's something else. And it's not a poke at the -- Mr. Victor here from DAGS or anything. It's just we've got this that we have to try

to deal with. So what we've got is a demolition permit. Are members of the CRC saying or thinking that we wanna wait a month or put a motion out there to -- that deals with the demolition permit right? Stanley?

Mr. Solamillo: I've got a recommendation.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Oh, recommendations. I even looked up there at the picture, but I didn't see the word.

Mr. Solamillo: Alright. We have a preferred alternative, and the preferred alternative, and this is a perfect world that we've been wishing would happen for 30 days, is that we would have found a permanent site to relocate this building and the former government buildings, which include the jail and the courthouse, to that site, that we connect all of the courthouse remnants together and rebuild the missing building section, and that we identified some non-government organization, or NGO, to permanently manage the properties and enter into a PA, or a programmatic agreement, to do that. But that hasn't happened. That's a preferred alternative.

Chair Fredericksen: And that hasn't happened in the intervening ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Solamillo: In the intervening time. So if no alternative to demolition can be found, then we have to accept the mitigation documents that have been prepared and presented to this Commission.

Mr. Hutaff: Okay, first of all, we didn't make the unsafe.

Mr. Solamillo: That's right. It's a liability now.

Mr. Hutaff: Okay. We didn't make it unsafe. We didn't allow it to get to this point. It's beyond us, okay? I do agree though that, you know, within a year, see if somebody steps up to say, ah, can I have it? Is a tad too long. And I would think that maybe we give it 60 days for someone to step up and go: I would like to do something with that. Then give them a year to do it. Okay. As far as the safety issue goes and stuff like that, it was unsafe before today, and it's going to be unsafe tomorrow. And whoever, you know, was accountable for that building, needs to step up and do something to keep the potential dangers from occurring, whether you rope it or whatever, tomorrow. That's not our responsibility, okay, but I think we should challenge that. I suggest we make a motion, alright, to delay the demolition by 60 days to give someone to step forward that expresses an interest, and a year to actually do it, from that date, or, better yet, eight months. So there's your year ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Sarich: Okay. I think that we should give them that long period of time in which to come up with a concrete plan for what they're going to do because they're not going to be able to do it that fast.

Mr. Hutaff: Well, yeah, especially since they're going to need permits to do it.

Ms. Sarich: Right.

Mr. Hutaff: You know, but they'll have to have the plan in order to clean and to -- and I don't really see that occurring. But, again, it goes under the word of "hope," yeah? So that's what I would suggest a motion be made to do.

Chair Fredericksen: Stanley? So that's the sum total of the recommendations, correct? Right up there?

Mr. Solamillo: Well, I mean it's you have a preferred alternative that you like.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Mr. Solamillo: It has not happened. We have a building --

Chair Fredericksen: Can we -- as Ray was talking or, you know, going on about - in a good way, Ray - can we do a -- have a time, I mean so it's not like the demolition permit starts tomorrow, the process, or --

Mr. Solamillo: You can do whatever you want. But this is just to get us --

Chair Fredericksen: Right.

Mr. Solamillo: We've got other --

Chair Fredericksen: I know.

Mr. Solamillo: We've got more demos to look at.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. Well, as a Commission, I guess what we need to think about, at this point, is the fact that this building's integrity has been severely compromised - it's been moved and half of it's gone. Yes, and the preferred alternative is what Stanley's put up there, and if no alternative is found, then, you know, the mitigation, the documents that have been put in - accept them. In my mind, this building would have to be completely -- it would have to be reconstructed, not -- it couldn't be renovated, or not renovated, restored because of all the hazmat junk that's in it. So I, personally, reluctantly would go, well, let's

figured out whatever time there is and after that, it's -- if nobody comes forth, than so be it. Now, as the Commission, do we want to put in a request that an additional 30 days lapse before -- if noone comes forward, then the permit goes through, the demolition permit starts?

Ms. Thomson: You can advise and recommend anything that this body desires to recommend, but you can't halt the demolition permit. It's not in a historic district so -- but you can recommend, you know, the Deputy Director was suggesting that one option is if anybody steps forward prior to the issuance of the demolition permit, or prior to physical demolition beginning, you know, that's one option.

Chair Fredericksen: Thanks, Richelle. Any comments, discussion, Commission Members? Brandis, I know ...(inaudible)... you're furling your eyebrows.

Ms. Sarich: I was just trying to interpret what she just said that we can't say we get two months and then --

Chair Fredericksen: It's not ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Hutaff: We can recommend.

Ms. Sarich: Okay.

Chair Fredericksen: Would request --

Mr. Hutaff: Request. There you go.

Ms. Sarich: I think we all feel pretty agreed on that.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Anyone want to put a motion forth?

Mr. Hutaff: I wish had spent more time in high school.

Ms. Kahulu Maluo: I have one question.

Chair Fredericksen: Yes?

Ms. Maluo: So the 30 days -- the 60 days would include the 30 days that have already passed, an additional 30 days, or is it 60 days from when we are suggesting -- recommending?

Chair Fredericksen: That's just, yeah --

Ms. McLean: From today. It would be from today. Whatever time ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Whatever, be it 30 or 60 days ...(inaudible)... if, you know, request that if noone comes forward by then, then the documentation's there.

Ms. Kanuha: I think that's fair.

Mr. Hutaff: I move that we take up the preferred recommendations up there and change the last line to give it a time of 60 days alternative for demolition and to seek out people who may have an interest in restoring the building or repairing the building.

Chair Fredericksen: And this is an opportunity for the folks that have been working on this to either put it into high gear, such as -- I mean this is how it is and, hopefully, they can come up with something workable, but I would go with the reconstruction with the other buildings in another place.

Mr. Hutaff: I think that's the end result. That's the end goal is to actually put them together, but we only have one building ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Oh yeah. And that's -- and we're not -- I'm just talking on the side.

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah. If we could talk about them all together, then we ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: But we can't. We need to do the one. I shouldn't have said anything. Okay, so that's -- have you don't your motion as is? ...(inaudible)... second?

Mr. Osako: I second.

*(Commissioner Chandler returned to the meeting at 12:49 p.m.)*

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. All those in favor say aye, except for Rhiannon. Any opposed? Okay, so we've got four - I'm the deciding one. You put in 60 days, right? Yeah. I reluctantly will go along with the majority on this because of the building's compromised integrity, but I hope that something can be worked out.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

***It has been moved by Mr. Hutaff, seconded by Mr. Osako, then***

***VOTED: take up the preferred recommendations as presented and change the last line to give it a time of 60 days alternative for demolition***

***and to seek out people who may have an interest in restoring the building or repairing the building.***

***(Assenting: E. Fredericksen; R. Hutaff; M. Kanuha; K. Maluo; W. Osako)***

***(Dissenting: B. Sarich)***

***(Abstaining - Due to being absent during discussions: R. Chandler)***

***(Excused: I. Ka`ahanui; B. U`u)***

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, so motion carries. Okay, Stanley.

*Mr. Solamillo read the following item description into the record:*

- 2. MR. MARTIN FREEBURG AIA, on behalf of the STATE OF HAWAI'I, DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES, requesting comments and recommendations on the demolition of BUILDING E, a plantation-era classroom building, and acceptance of Historic American Building Survey Level III as Mitigation for the Adverse Effect of Demolition, located at the former Kahului Civic Center, 189 West Ka'ahumanu Avenue, TMK (2) 3-7-004:003, Kahului, Maui. The CRC may provide comments and recommendations. Public testimony will be accepted (S. Solamillo)**

Chair Fredericksen: Stanley, I apologize. Suzie was signaling me that our lunch is here.

Mr. Solamillo: Okay.

Chair Fredericksen: And so let's -- do we wanna work through lunch, eating lunch, folks, or do we wanna take -- okay, let's take a break and then -- or what do we wanna do - 15, 30 minutes? Or do we wanna eat through lunch? Okay, we'll multi-task. Okay. Yeah, let's take a five-minute break and then we'll --

Mr. Solamillo: How about 15 so that at least the applicants can go get something?

Chair Fredericksen: Oh, sure. Okay, do you wanna take more? Is that going to be enough? Is that enough? Well, we'll -- go get lunch -- ostensibly taking 15 minutes. But if need be, it'll be more.

*(A recess was called at 12:52 p.m., and the meeting was reconvened at 1:15 p.m.)*

Chair Fredericksen: We'll reconvene, and eat, and let Stanley get the presentation going.

Mr. Solamillo: Some of you have seen this presentation before, for those of you who haven't, we're just giving you background. Originally, this demolition came in as one of two demolitions, which are being asked for simultaneously by Department of Accounting and General Services. Kahului has a long history and most of it is not really visible today as you drive down Kaahumanu Avenue towards the airport. Back in 1900, it was a port with a bustling Asian community nearby, and in 1899, it was recorded in this map, and there was fire that was set purposely after the fire in Honolulu because of the threat of bubonic plague, and that's what wiped out Kahului's first town. And then the same people, the Territorial Board of Health, which set fire to Honolulu, set fire here, went on to Hilo, chasing bubonic plague in the week that followed.

The buildings shown here partially obscure the -- with the label "Japanese Stores and Dwellings" appear to have been the location of the Chinese corridor, which was burned by the Territorial Board of Health on March 1900. Some of the commercial buildings that were built after the fire probably similar to those shown at the bottom of the slide. And then the next major map was done in 1911 and it showed an improved Kahului Harbor as well as the beginnings of a grid pattern, which eventually became Kahului Town - I'll call it "Kahului Town 2." And this existed up until the post war period when everything was demolished for the creation of Dream City. The school lot is outlined in yellow and identified with an arrow. It shows on the original 1911 town plat as well as this map taken in 1931, and this was the site of what became Kahului Elementary School, it was a permanent school building, which was erected in 1927, constructed of brick and demolished in 1996, and there was a campus of wood buildings, which had been erected earlier or removed later on to the site, and at the time that the application first came in, there was no history of the campus or of the school buildings located there, which had been prepared by the Department of Education, or DOE. And 1959 shows the town as it had been gridded off as well as the new roads, which became Dream City and the Maui shopping mall or Kahului Shopping Center, which was built in 1959. In 1971, we've got an aerial that shows the WPA perimeter wall on the left, which was in 1938; the Kahului School building 1927; adjacent camps as well as Kahului Shopping Center, which was built in 1959. Between 1971 and 2011, there were eight demolitions of Kahului School buildings on this parcel; 2011, which was last year, DAGS came in with the two that were part of this application, this was the larger of the two. Up to this point, we still have very little histories on the Territorial School buildings that were constructed between 1910 and 1940. They're significant. The ones that remain are left on Lana'i, Moloka'i, and Maui. Of all of those that -- that still remain, there's only -- I believe only Pu'unene School and Pa'ia School are the listed school buildings.

Unidentified Speaker: ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Solamillo: Excuse me?

Ms. Sarich: I'm sorry, Stanley. Pa`ia School is the one up in the hill?

Mr. Solamillo: No. Pa`ia School isn't shown here actually. Pa`ia School is up towards Makawao, on Baldwin Avenue. It's listed. Pu`unene School, the concrete building is listed. None of the wood buildings are. Kaupo School is the only wood building in Maui County that's listed on the National Register, built in 1922. So wood buildings are unprotected at this point. We have several architectural precedents that go in the construction of school buildings in Maui County, one are for link lanais, which become enclosed, and a lot of these were borrowed. They were adopted for ka hale construction then actually employed in early stores at the turn of the century. The window wall that was made famous for Rosenwald Schools was adopted and employed in the schools here in Maui County. And Pu`unene School probably has the largest selection of wood -- intact wood school buildings left. Lana`i Elementary School, I believe these buildings have been replaced. The only ones that have been retained are lying in a gulch. Some have molded battens, but they're in a poor state deterioration. This was Kahului School. It came in for demolition in 1996 and it was in a pretty severe state of decay when it was brought in. And we're left with now Kahului Elementary School, 1939, variation of a U-plan with the wall's continuous lanai and enclosed ends.

This earlier building, the last time it came before the Commission, the recommendation was to, because it had been severely altered, was to allow for its demolition. And then the recommendation for the one that we're looking at today, because it was determined as eligible, we wanted other things done besides HABS mitigation, and one of those was to exhaust all alternatives to demolition before we'd allow for the demolition to take place. In the meantime, DAGS hired Glen Mason Architects to prepare an evaluation of a mitigation report for this specific building. Barbara Long, of Friends of Old Maui School, looked at the building and asked that if demolition does take place, that she be allowed, on behalf of her organization, to salvage wood doors and windows. And because this is part of what is perceived as a trend or a pattern, I think at this point we can begin asking the department to provide us with a little bit more than piecemeal demolitions because we don't know how big the inventory of DAGS-owned properties are. I do know, for instance, Kahului Railroad building sold to another state agency earlier this year or last year and is that going to be another building that comes to us in the near future for a demolition. There's no cultural resource management plan for that agency on how it handles cultural resources or how it handles buildings over 50 years of age accept to let them decay and then bring them forward for demolition applications. If the department receives federal funding, then we would start to question whether they're in compliance with their Section 106 responsibilities as a state agency who has charge and responsibility for cultural resources.

At this point, if there's no questions, the applicant can address any questions, and Glen Mason can address any questions that you might have in regards to his evaluation report and mitigation report.



Chair Fredericksen: Thank you, Stanley.

Mr. David Victor: I'm David Victor, Maui District Engineer for DAGS. We propose to demolish the two buildings at Kahului Civic Center, Building B, which is the one that you've already approved for demolition, and Building E, which is the one that is being considered today. Building E is very similar to the Kaunakakai building that we discussed earlier. It's old wooden severely termite damaged, full of hazardous materials. The asbestos is in the floor tile; PCBs in the light fixtures; lead in the paint; and mercury in the fluorescent light lamps. As far as demolition, and I'll respond to Commissioner Kanuha's previous concerns about hazardous materials demolition, the plans and specs require that the demolition contractor comply with EPA standard procedures, yeah, so when the demolition is done, all work will have to comply in order to prevent contamination from spreading and the hazardous substances being inhaled or absorbed by people in the vicinity. We've also had problems at this particular building. There's a lot of homeless people who congregate and camp on the Pa`ia side, they camp adjacent to it, and sleep under it. And from time to time, we've had to evict them.

At this time, Glen Mason, from Mason Architects, who will speak about cultural and historic aspects of the building.

Mr. Glen Mason: Yeah, let me give you -- this is Glen Mason. Let me give you a little background. I think there was a letter or a couple of letters, one from SHPD and one from the county, about this site probably after it was first considered, and so DAGS then brought us in or Bob Freeburg brought us in to work with this. Our first step was we did, you know, kind of what we did at Kaunakakai where we took a look at it, we did some basic research, and we felt that this building did retain integrity and that it was historically significant. So once that step was reached, then the questions was, well, what more do we need to do in terms of documentation to learn more about the building and tell the story? So we actually had a meeting with Ross, from State Historic Preservation Division, called up Stanley and said, hey, what -- how far do we -- what do we need to look at here? How far do you want us to go? And so the Historic American Building Survey format that we use try to answer a lot of those questions. One of them that was made very clear to us by Stanley is that we really needed to research the history of the school. Even though most of the pieces or a lot of the significant pieces of the school were missing, we really didn't know very much about the school, and so a lot of our research, from that point on, was focused on learning more about the school and the history of the school, and when buildings were built, and I mean, for example, we actually made, it turns out, a really good guess that the building was built about 1939 the first time we did the research, but we were able to verify that by going to -- doing a lot more digging and whatnot. And so the HABS form that we -- or the HABS format that we follow tries to pull all of this research together into some, you know, something that actually contributes to the record of the site as well as the building. And that's really all that we've done so far. There's been a fair amount of research done and

I think there's -- but there's no -- don't think there's also any argument here, completely flipped from the other one, that this is a historically significant building and this would be potentially eligible for the register so --

Chair Fredericksen: Any questions or comments from the Commission?

Ms. Sarich: I just had a question for Victor actually. When he brings up mercury and things that are in the lights, aren't they in the lights here?

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. Fluorescent.

Ms. Sarich: Yeah.

Mr. Victor: Probably, but to a lesser extent. What the lighting industry has done is reduce significantly the mercury in current lamps, but the old ones had quite a bit. The newer ones have just a little.

Ms. Sarich: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other questions or comments at this point?

Ms. Chandler: Chair, thank you. I wanted to ask, we did -- I remember seeing the other building, and I remember voting on it, and at that time knowing that there was another building on the site --

Chair Fredericksen: This is that one.

Ms. Chandler: Yes. I don't remember at that time if we knew that the next -- like we would be hearing about demolition of the next fairly quickly, and I remember that being persuasive to me saying, okay, well, maybe we can allow this building to go; if there's another building on the site --

Chair Fredericksen: ...(inaudible)... integrity was compromised like the other one.

Ms. Chandler: Yes. Yeah. This one seems a little different and -- and after this one, there are no more buildings related to the school. Is that true, Stan?

Mr. Victor: There are several older buildings left on the site. One of the buildings is used by the Department of Education for adult -- for community adult education, so that building's there, and the MEO transportation people use some of the smaller buildings.

Ms. Chandler: Are they comparable to the size of this building that's proposed for demolition?

Mr. Victor: The one being used by the DOE --

Ms. Chandler: The ones that are left. Yeah.

Mr. Victor: Is probably bigger than this one, yeah.

Ms. Chandler: And same date range?

Mr. Victor: I don't know. Maybe Stanley have some information on that. The architecture is similar to except they're not post and pier construction; they slab on grade.

Ms. Chandler: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Solamillo: The buildings that remain are great but I think they're associated with administration functions, but they're close to the road so that leaves, after these are gone, that leaves -- most of this side will be cleared. You've got the little administration building, the one that is compromised and had been altered, that's the furthest one out, so you're moving towards the road. So maybe in ten years you'll get to see those.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah, I was gonna say, are those buildings under DAGS or are they maintained by someone else?

Mr. Victor: Those buildings are under our jurisdiction and the DOE and MEO are tenants. I think there's a agreement where they use the property free of charge, they do have to pay for their own utilities, but as far as us collecting rent from either agency, we don't do it.

Ms. Chandler: Do you also oversee the buildings on the Pu`unene Elementary School campus?

Mr. Victor: We do to a certain extent, yeah. They actually come under the jurisdiction of the DOE, but as far as any repairs and construction, the DOE goes through us also.

Ms. Chandler: So if they were to come for demolition, would that come from you or would that come from another entity?

Mr. Victor: That would come through the DOE, but when it comes to the construction portion of the demolition, you know, where the contractor goes out there, then it would come under DAGS. But as far as the planning and design, the DOE has their own staff to do that.

Ms. Chandler: Oh, okay. I have one more question. Is there another -- is there an intended future use for this?

Mr. Victor: Yes, there is. Back in the late '80s, I think the parcel is pretty good size parcel with a real good location right in the middle of Kahului and the intent was to use the parcel as a state office building. Renderings were done, you know, no real drawings, but they had some architectural renderings showing a six-story office building, with parking, and due to the tsunami inundation zone, the bottom floor was actually kinda left open and the top floors had offices inside. But, currently, that project is still on the books and due to fiscal or lack of funding, you know, from the late '80s till now, things have changed, so there's just no money, so the money committees for the senate and house just bypass it every time it comes for review. I think the initial cost back in 1990 were -- a cost estimate was maybe 30 million, and now it's probably three times that, yeah.

Ms. Chandler: So the demo of this building would be a necessary step towards building that office building in the future?

Mr. Victor: Yes.

Ms. Chandler: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Victor: You know, realistically speaking, I don't think that project is going to be funded for quite a long time.

Ms. Chandler: Thank you.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other comments, discussion? Stanley, did you have something you wanted to share with us?

Mr. Solamillo: So today we're talking about taking this one out. This is a big one that we were looking at that's gone. All of these are gone. This is a U-plan here. And this one is the one that you approved at the last meeting. And I think there's one more here. So those will be the two buildings that remain on this site. This is the road. And the library is over here.

Chair Fredericksen: Brandis, do you have a -- what are your thoughts?

Ms. Sarich: I just wanted to say that, well, I appreciate how good the HABS report was, that was really informational, and that I think is why we were willing to let the other building go because we wanted -- that was our concession to actually get this all researched, and that was really well done. I still don't think that is enough of a mitigation to say go ahead

and tear Building E down. I just -- it is this pattern. I kind of feel like, as a Commission, we need to ask for a full inventory of their properties before we approve anymore demolitions.

Chair Fredericksen: That's a very good point. Totally agreed.

Ms. Sarich: And as far as the value of this building, it wasn't covered that it actually wasn't a Rosenwald plan, and everybody's familiar with what that was, I think, from the last meeting.

Mr. Solamillo: I'll jump in here on this one.

Chair Fredericksen: Stanley.

Mr. Solamillo: The suggestion that we had a Rosenwald influence comes from the window banks or window walls, and that comes correspondence which I found mentioned in the Department of Education reports from the teens, so anything further beyond that, that is only a suggestion that the planners here, who were responsible for educational buildings, were in contact with those folks who were responsible for the design of Rosenwald Schools, that's only, at this point, a little bit more than conjectural. I don't have an actual memo that says here's a copy of our building plans and you can do it from there 'cause they would need to be researched further. Okay.

Ms. Sarich: Thank you. I was saying even though we don't have that evidence, we still have a building that was really about that time. It was for a rural community. It has daylight. It has all of these things that we look for --

Chair Fredericksen: Its integrity is not compromised so much.

Ms. Sarich: Right. But it also is a model. I mean we're kind of going back to this in architecture now where we're trying -- I mean we're not trying to have a toxic building, but we're trying to actually have daylight and a building that's built for our climate and so on, and this is a good example of that. I just -- I wish it could be used for something. I mean we seen two really wonderful projects today that are reusing history and this is another one that just has to find a purpose.

Mr. Hutaff: For me, you're correct. This school reminds me of Kalakaua and Kapa`a Elementary School that I went to because it's the same design. The building that was torn down in 1996, when I drive past Kalakaua, which I do every time we go to Oahu, it's the same building, okay. I think that these are important because that kind of architecture I've seen across all the islands in my memory of going to school in places that I went to school when I didn't go to new schools. That area there, if you drive down that street, if you look to the right, there are no open areas. If you look to the left, that's the only open area there

is. And if you go to other parts of other islands, like Oahu and stuff like that, you see where they've broken up intense building areas with parks. If we keep this building, we keep a part of all of Hawai'i's school history, and we keep the area, hopefully, open, like it should be visually. I think it's important.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, just going back to Brandis's comment, and I think Stanley had that up there at one point too, there certainly is a need for an inventory for buildings that DAGS has jurisdiction over, and as a Commission, I think would be something very worthy to recommend that there be an inventory of these buildings provided. I mean how many buildings are there? Where are they? Something like that. Why don't we talk a little bit more if there's a need for more discussion, or let's see if there's -- we haven't done public comment on this, so let's go ahead and see if there's any public comment and then we can talk some more. I don't think there is but -- okay? There being no public comment, we'll close comment at this point. So what's the Commission's thoughts at this stage of the game? We're here for a demolition permit, and there's been some HABS information that's been furnished on this building, but as Brandis pointed out, the last time, you know, it didn't appear that was going to be quite so quick coming up about with a demolition. So what are the -- what are your folks' thoughts, Commission's thoughts on this, the demolition permit, or this particular building at this stage?

Ms. Sarich: I mean did we ask them to try to come up with alternatives and do we know if they actually did that?

Mr. Hutaff: I remember that we asked the -- and the comment was made that, you know, right at that time budget was like really, really --

Chair Fredericksen: Which that comment's not going to change for some time given the economic reality.

Mr. Hutaff: Well, actually, I recommended that we don't give up on it because things will change, and that if this one can be held on for a while, chances are things will change. I think that, as far as a recommendation goes, is that we look at rehabilitating the building period. No other comments needed.

Chair Fredericksen: Could I -- could the DAGS engineer come back up, please? Is this building used for anything right now?

Mr. Victor: No, it's currently abandoned.

Chair Fredericksen: So what -- you're saying that the homeless like camping on the side that's kind of out of view and all of that?

Mr. Victor: Yeah, there's a little space between the building and the student housing on the Pa`ia side and the homeless tend to congregate in there, and when they do, we evict them, and a few months later, they tend to come back.

Chair Fredericksen: How long's the building not been in use?

Mr. Victor: I'd say maybe a year-and-a-half. The last user was MEO. They had a thrift shop.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. I was just going to ask. That's what I remember. And so the way that DAGS approaches buildings in this area, are they only offered to lease to public agencies, like MEO or nonprofits, or --

Mr. Victor: Yes. That's correct.

Chair Fredericksen: And the reason being?

Mr. Victor: I think it's state law.

Chair Fredericksen: So state buildings can't be rented by anybody other than nonprofits and state agencies and county agencies?

Mr. Victor: To my knowledge, no. They do have a provision for state land to be leased out.

Chair Fredericksen: Right. That was my next question.

Mr. Victor: And that comes through the DLNR, yeah. So from time to time, the DLNR holds auctions to --

Chair Fredericksen: For land.

Mr. Victor: For land.

Chair Fredericksen: But for buildings --

Mr. Victor: As far as buildings are concerned, I'm pretty sure it has to be a government or nonprofit entity.

Chair Fredericksen: Interesting use or non-use of some state resources because I'm sure that in the private sector, there's --

Ms. Chandler: It could generate income.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. There's demand for neat buildings and everything to rent, to lease, whatever it may be. So is this something that would be very -- would the legislature have to do something to change that? It's just a question.

Mr. Victor: Erik, you know, that's not my area of expertise so I don't know.

Chair Fredericksen: Sure, but I'm just -- 'cause you're the only one here so I'm just -- and I don't -- I know nothing about it at all. I'm just --

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. Because it's part of the problem, unfortunately. I mean if there were some kind of stream of income to help to renovate these buildings ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Just like what happened to the church.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah.

Chair Fredericksen: I mean, you know, they've been able to be stewards because they've had paid tenants.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah, except -- true, but the tenant's actually doing the restoration, right? So in this case, like in my case, I have a nonprofit organization, we occupy two Pu`unene Elementary School buildings, and we renovate them. We termite them. We paint them. We make sure that they stay in good condition.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. So there's some level of maintenance happening, yeah.

Ms. Chandler: And so -- and if MEO was in this building as recently as a year-and-a-half ago, you know, is there a possibility of another nonprofit occupying this building? And nonprofits write grants to get funding for renovation. That's how we do it. You know, so if -- I just feel like there's still life in it.

Chair Fredericksen: Working within the way the system is setup at this point, that's a great point, Rhiannon.

Mr. Hutaff: As far as the homeless and stuff, sleeping under that building, they are going to be beginning construction across the street and will probably eliminate the homeless from being around because of all the construction equipment stuff, there'll be security there, so that'll end-up not being a non-issue eventually. What kinda -- I have a question, like with everything that's being built around it, eliminating these buildings one at a time opens up opportunities for six-story buildings to come up.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.



Mr. Hutaff: And anybody, if I was A&B, and I just invested 25 million dollars in apartment buildings for the college, and I'm going to invest another 30 million dollars for a office building, I'd certainly wanna increase the value of my property by not having that there. So that's maybe something I can be pushing wheels, beyond you, as far as people to get involved ...(inaudible)... this open.

Chair Fredericksen: I've got one more question regarding MEO again. What was the reason for them leaving their lease or just choosing not to renew their lease? Do you know?

Mr. Victor: Well, they're still using the property, so they have their bus transportation facilities there and --

Chair Fredericksen: Right. But for the structure though?

Mr. Victor: They heard we were -- we had plans to demolish the building and that cause them to move out. They plan to move near -- I guess across the street from the Pu`unene Post Office.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay.

Mr. Victor: So they're eventually going to vacate that parcel and get their own --

Chair Fredericksen: That'll be their whole base of operation, so to speak.

Mr. Victor: Yes. Yes. So I think it's several years down the road, but that's their ultimate plan.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other questions or comments, Commission Members?

Ms. Chandler: I would -- yes. I know that you didn't personally neglect these buildings, and I'm sorry that we're going to channel, to a certain degree, our frustration towards you. That leads me to think that if MEO's going to pull out of their transportation buildings on Kahului School, that those buildings, shortly after, will be coming to the Commission also for demo. Do you believe that's probable?

Mr. Victor: Yes. That's -- because they're in pretty bad shape. I guess, you know, all of these buildings were built around the same time a long time ago and they are in pretty bad shape. The problem is always money. And, as an example, I put in to have these buildings demolished maybe nine, ten years ago, and funding was only approved maybe year-and-a-half ago. So it takes time just because there's not that much money out there, yeah, and everybody's competing for funds, so it'll probably come through but not right away.

Ms. Chandler: How much does it cost to demolish a building?

Mr. Victor: We estimate maybe, you know, because of the hazardous material removal, maybe about 80,000, off the top of my head.

Ms. Chandler: So more money than it would cost to tent it, probably, once every several years. I think that needs to be part of the recommendation.

Mr. Victor: Well, if you're talking about reconstruction too, I mean it's not renovation, you know, or repair, it's reconstruction, a lot of the --

Ms. Chandler: No. Tenting to prevent the need for reconstruction.

Chair Fredericksen: Further damage.

Mr. Victor: Well, it's past that stage.

Ms. Chandler: I understand that, but there's other buildings that aren't past that stage yet. I'm thinking more in the future than in the past.

Mr. Victor: The ones that are being used, particularly the one that the DOE is in, has been reroofed and tented. So because they are occupied, we -- and we don't know when that six-story building project is going to be funded, probably who knows, 20, 25 years from now, as long as the buildings are being occupied, we maintain it.

Ms. Chandler: So for the DOE, the one that the DOE is occupying, is that the only building on this campus that a state agency is occupying at this time?

Mr. Victor: Yes.

Ms. Chandler: Okay. And does that building fit into the plans of the six-story building that would come up or would that building also need to come down in order for that project to move forward?

Mr. Victor: It'll be decided at the time. The initial plans that I saw that were done back in 1990 or so called for the six-story building to be done in two phases, yeah, and I think, in the first phase, the DOE adult ed structure would remain, and when the second phase came in, it would be demolished. But, you know, that was only a plan done back in 1990 so, you know, whether or not that holds any water, yeah, we don't know.

Ms. Chandler: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, thanks for all the candid answers too. Like Rhiannon said, we're not trying to put you on the hot seat or anything, we're just trying to deal with a difficult situation and figure things out as best we can as a Commission. Okay, any other thoughts at this point? Stanley, you have -- you wanna go over recommendations?

Mr. Solamillo: And my recommendations are, will be unpopular, and they become unpopular because I was -- actually, it was really interesting. I got a call the other day and I had to go into a building. And the building was off of Lower Main. It was a total wreck. There were family photographs everywhere. Completely overgrown. Really cool building. And I said you know what? I did this 20 years ago. I was in South Dallas and we had these -- we had created these National Register Districts in some of the poorer neighborhoods in town because they were the neighborhoods that were turn of the century neighborhoods where Jews and Black people were relegated to under segregation, alright? So when white flight occurred, these were the redline neighborhoods, so these were the places where minorities were forced to live. And I said, but 20 years ago -- the only difference between this particular building and the building that I was in 20 years ago was the one that I was in 20 years ago, there were needles all over the place, and this one hadn't gotten that far yet. When we deal with death and dying of buildings, and we've got transitional populations, and we've got really strong -- a really strong drug culture that seems out of control a lot of the times, this is -- the two will mix and they'll either, you know, become a place to shoot up, to make crime, or burn down because you wanna, you know, just build a fire on a cold night. So I'm a little less -- I'm a little less able, at this point, to recommend an indefinite let the building stand until it falls kind of thing. So based on that, we've heard today, in summary, that the building, although it's been slightly altered, is intact and retains it's integrity so it would be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A and C, and if no alternatives to demolition can be found, then I would have to recommend that the mitigation for the adverse effect of demolition should be HABS mitigation, Level 3. We received a mitigation report that's been provided by the State of Hawai'i, Department of Accounting and General Services. We've also received a request from the Friends of Old Maui High School to salvage wood doors and windows. And because this represents what might in fact be a trend, or a pattern, we're asking that an inventory of all properties in the jurisdiction of DAGS be supplied to the CRC so that we can know exactly what's coming down the pike. And I think that should form the basis for some sort of discussion because, certainly, there has to be some sort of agreement that would have been done years ago that may have fallen through the cracks about how does a state agency handle last resources of this nature, you know, and maintain its compliance with cultural resource law, both state and federal. And that's really -- if you wanna put a time limit, like we just did, that's okay, but an indefinite, given the homeless population that congregates around the property today -- oh, when I went down there to do initial shots, I think it was almost a year ago when this first case first came in, it was kinda dicey then, and the -- it's just dicey.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Comments? I'll just note my frustrated displeasure. And then any comments, discussion, folks?

Ms. Chandler: I understand what you're saying, Stan. I -- and I think the only thing that really scares me is that I don't want every single building on this campus to fall. If we do approve this demolition, unfortunately, I'm not going to be on the Commission long enough to make sure that the last building at Kahului School still stands, but I don't know if we could put something in there, like "leave a building," you know, or something. I mean it's really sad. So if we're going to put that inventory of all buildings over 50 years old, you know, that is in Maui County under DAGS, I think we should put a date that we would like to receive that by 'cause, obviously, that's a lot of work, but I don't want it to get pushed off into never, you know. We don't want to get it here so that we can know what's coming. Like I said, I didn't know this one was coming up so quickly after the last one so --

Chair Fredericksen: Stanley, could you come back up, please? Okay, on this inventory that you put up there, what is your, for buildings over 50 years old, 50 or 50 years older, but what is your definition of "inventory" in that? Just like, okay, there's this building in Pu`unene and one over here. That's what you're talking about? Just broad brush strokes.

Mr. Solamillo: Yeah.

Chair Fredericksen: Right. Okay.

Mr. Solamillo: Because we have no clue.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Mr. Solamillo: You know, it's like X property on Moloka`i, right? X property on Lana`i. They're all coming in piecemeal and it's like we're getting to the point now where, yeah, it does look like a pattern. We'll let 'em get so bad where they become a life safety issue and then we bring it in for a demo so --

Ms. Chandler: And I think it could be part of a larger conversation with SHPD between maybe the county and SHPD that our Commission keeps hearing this and this is also the state arm, why are we not, you know, watching what's happening on the other side and maybe more funding from one side to the other needs to be transferred, you know, so that we can prevent this kind of thing 'cause this is their mission, the mission of SHPD is prevent this kind of stuff, so this is really confusing.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, and I'm just kind of -- I've been mulling this over a little bit and I'm kind of -- I'm a little perplexed by how, okay, state land, if it's in harbors, there's plenty of commercial slips in the harbors. I mean so how come the state does that but then when

there's -- when it's with all buildings and stuff, it's like, oh, only -- and I'm not trying to say that non-profits and governmental agencies shouldn't be offered things, maybe they should be offered them first, and if nobody has a use for it, then, okay, offer for lease to private, the private sector, and, you know, if a nonprofit can't pay \$1,500 a month and agree to maintain it, boy I betcha that there's a private firm that would be happy to pay a thousand a month and just maintain stuff to have a space, and that's in a prime location in Kahului. But that's something that I don't understand why that is such.

Ms. Chandler: After MEO pulled out, is there -- was there an offer for any other entity to occupy this space or because you're moving on the path of demolition, that's not what was offered?

Mr. Victor: There was no offer. DOE would continue to be a tenant on the property. But as far as any other government, nonprofit, or private offers ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: I guess what I'm thinking of, and this certainly goes beyond this one property, but, I mean geez, how many properties are there in the state that it's just like, well, if nobody wants it for a dollar a year, then it's just going to sit there vacant when there could be revenues raised and the buildings would be maintained, and there'd be places for private outfits to have so -- I know that's beyond this agenda item ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Solamillo: And not to even beat the horse a little further, how many units could we carve out of this building, low income?

Ms. Sarich: How much income out of this building?

Mr. Solamillo: How many units could we carve out of this?

Ms. Sarich: Oh. Yeah.

Mr. Solamillo: Okay.

Ms. Sarich: We could get six apartments in there.

Mr. Solamillo: Right. So I mean this is kind of like we're not thinking. But anyway --

Ms. Chandler: Wow. That's a good idea.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, out of the box.

Mr. Hutaff: That's a great idea.

Chair Fredericksen: Out of the box --

Mr. Solamillo: But that's -- but you gotta move it to land, right, so there's a whole deal, you gotta move it to land and gotta get -- but that's what we should be looking at a lot of ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, a lot of -- there needs to be some out of the box --

Mr. Hutaff: Like they do in Hana, pass it off to the teachers.

Ms. Chandler: There's another state agency, which is OHA, which has a whole lot of land and a lot of money right now offering grants to create housing.

Mr. Solamillo: There you go. Okay, two and two. So now we've got -- we've got X-number of days, which this Commission shall decide, we've got an idea, and a lead, and maybe we'll see one saved yet.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. It's an out-of-the-box approach, but it's something that needs at least be explored.

Mr. Hutaff: I don't think that's out of the box. I think that's right in the box. And, boy, you certainly could ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Well, the box that was used before hasn't been looked -- I mean there wasn't anything before where it's just like, well, if it's at least a governmental agency or a nonprofit.

Ms. Kanuha: And, you know, I know Punanaleo, right over here, they've been having challenges with their building, so, you know, that might be something else. I know they're moving forward trying to build something permanent, but I think the building at Kaahumanu Church is actually being weathered and needs a lot of attention, plus I think they wanna expand and have more children so --

Mr. Hutaff: It could be said that that area there is part of the educational system for Kahului.

Ms. Kanuha: Like right smack in the middle of ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Hutaff: ...(inaudible)... I could see you could sell it for public, you certainly could get everybody to listen to that. Good idea.

Ms. Kanuha: Housing, education --

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, now we have to frame these ideas into the context of a demolition number -- item 2, under it. You have anymore thoughts, Stanley?

Mr. Solamillo: No.

Chair Fredericksen: Rhiannon?

Mr. Solamillo: This Commission has a lot of very smart people on it, which is --

Ms. Chandler: Okay, can we write a letter to SHPD and ask them if we can examine any other reuse for this building, as in other agencies using it, nonprofit agencies, or Puanaleo, or I don't -- low-income housing was a great, great thought and then I just thought about zoning, I don't know if it's because it's commercial and I don't know, but either way, maybe just explore and 'cause it's not hurting anybody right now.

Mr. Solamillo: I would relocate it.

Ms. Chandler: Relocate the building? Okay. That's wonderful. That's great too.

Mr. Hutaff: You have to. You have an apartment building right next door.

Mr. Solamillo: Yeah, but it's --

Chair Fredericksen: Well, that's a different property though.

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah, well, it's right next door...(inaudible)...

Mr. Solamillo: It goes back to this whole issue of land.

Chair Fredericksen: Right.

Mr. Solamillo: Right? Who's the landowner? The landowner has different plans for the property. So if we wanna be creative with saving a building, you gotta get creative. So you gotta wait 50 years till you're nominated.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. I still think that maybe a letter to SHPD --

Chair Fredericksen: Is this in -- this isn't in the Kahului Historic District isn't it?

Mr. Solamillo: There's no Kahului Historic District.

Chair Fredericksen: Well, not that County does, but the state -- the historic district site. There's a site -- historic district site number for Kahului.

Mr. Solamillo: I don't know.

Chair Fredericksen: I bet it is. I just can't remember how far over it goes towards Kaahumanu Avenue. I know it's not a county historic district, but I believe it's in the -- it's the Kahului -- I think it's called the "Kahului Historic District." If Hinano hadn't taken off, he could possibly provide us the site number even. Okay, so --

Mr. Solamillo: So I guess the question is: Do you wanna do essentially what we did with the last one, which was give it a certain amount of time, but have closure?

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Mr. Solamillo: So that the applicant isn't waiting for an indefinite period of time.

Chair Fredericksen: Thoughts, Commission Members?

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. I think we should give it at least maybe three months for a concerted effort to find a either new location or a tenant that would be able to rehabilitate the structure, and I don't know -- it's kinda like you're putting onus back on the state who wants to demolish it though, so I don't know how hard -- you know? I mean it's almost like it's better if we were the ones who were looking for a tenant and a land and stuff, but we don't do that. This is not our -- you know, so --

Chair Fredericksen: Any other thoughts?

Ms. Sarich: I don't think three months seems like enough time.

Mr. Hutaff: Maybe because this is a different animal.

Chair Fredericksen: Oh yeah.

Mr. Hutaff: ...(inaudible)... have a little hint of somebody having an interest in this. I can't think of anybody who would consider a building, a school, a whole school building, something of value, at this point. I don't know anybody, I'm sure there is somebody, but I don't know anybody. I would just try to, you know, keep the building alive - rent it out; do you what you suggested; look at alternative uses, you know, whether it be housing, you know, for students or teachers, to keep the place going.

Ms. Sarich: Are we allowed to say, no, you can't tear it down?



Mr. Hutaff: Yeah, we could say it.

Ms. Chandler: We can recommend that they don't.

Mr. Hutaff: That's a recommendation.

Ms. Chandler: But it's still a recommendation, unfortunately.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Ms. McLean: To me, it sounds like that's what your feeling is that it should not be demolished.

Ms. Sarich: Yes.

Ms. McLean: I mean find some other use, find another location, etcetera, but your feeling is that it should not be demolished so your recommendation can be as plain as that.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. And let's -- and if the state is unsuccessful and comes back with documentation of their efforts to locate or to try to solicit interest in the building, then we revisit the issue, and if it doesn't work, and the state comes back, we revisit the issue.

Ms. Sarich: So we can say that we believe this is a significant cultural resource and we cannot recommend --

Mr. Hutaff: Historic.

Ms. Sarich: Historic resource. Okay.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Ms. McLean: And as you said, you believe there are viable options for an occupant or for its use at that location or another location, unlike some other ones that you've seen where that's not the case.

Chair Fredericksen: Is that --

Ms. Chandler: Yes.

Chair Fredericksen: I think that's -- it's a frustrating situation, but I -- it's not the same as that building on Moloka'i, which clearly -- it's got some local historic significance, but it's been compromised so badly. This hasn't.

Ms. Chandler: This is different.

Chair Fredericksen: It's a different story. And it's still on the property with which it has its association and it hasn't been moved and half of it cut away and whatever else.

Ms. Kanuha: You know, I just thought about something too 'cause I know there's times that the state would like rent out buildings or office space, and if this is the state, on state land, and the building, why would we not like renovate that building and not pay rent?

Ms. Chandler: On a building they don't own.

Ms. Kanuha: On a building that they don't own. You know what I mean? I mean --

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Ms. Kanuha: 'Cause I know, in the past, they've gone and rented buildings around and have office space.

Ms. Chandler: One Main Plaza.

Chair Fredericksen: SHPD has -- they're renting -- no. That's the DLNR annex, but there examples ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Kanuha: But you know what I'm saying is that why not keep the money in the house instead of renting out space?

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. So we can add that to the motion too as a possibility for what could be done. So I think we could move that the CRC does not recommend that this building be torn down and that possible uses for the building ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Would you like to make a motion?

Ms. Chandler: I would like to make a motion.

Chair Fredericksen: It sounds like it. Well, let's get it all out first.

Ms. Sarich: The inventory.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Ms. Chandler: Oh yes.

Chair Fredericksen: So go ahead make your motion, please.

Ms. Chandler: So I move that the building not be recommended for demolition and that other uses be explored for the building including renting and possibly having the tenant renovate, or renting to the private sector or a nonprofit entity, or rented by a state agency because there are state agencies that rent other buildings, or possibly relocated if necessary to another site. And I further recommend that there be an inventory of all DAGS properties that are over 50 years old in Maui County provided -- buildings -- all DAGS buildings that are over 50 years old in Maui County be provided to the Planning Department so that we are aware of what other properties, like this one -- buildings like this one might be up for demolition as well.

Ms. Sarich: And I -- can we add to the motion still or --

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. There's no second so we can discuss before --

Ms. Sarich: I like your idea of actually before this is brought back to us that we actually get to see documentation that they have looked for alternatives.

Chair Fredericksen: Yes, and what the alternatives were. Any other ideas?

Mr. Hutaff: I kinda like not saying anything about moving the building as an alternative at this point. It can always come up at another point.

Mr. Osako: Because if you move it, then it's not eligible, correct?

Chair Fredericksen: The building's saved, but yes.

Mr. Hutaff: And then it also opens up the whole lot area for other uses. I think just eliminating that sentence, we didn't say it. You can always ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, there's no second at this point so we're still crafting the -- the motion is still in the process of being crafted.

Mr. Hutaff: Are you okay with modifying that part of it?

Ms. Chandler: I understand your point. You're saying that if we propose that it could possibly be moved that it probably would be and other avenues wouldn't be explored first.

Mr. Hutaff: Or, yeah, and then we would move the whole area to ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Chandler: Okay. Sure. I agree with that.

Chair Fredericksen: Other thoughts before --

Ms. Maluo: Did I miss the time frame on the inventory report?

Chair Fredericksen: That's good. Some sort of a time -- time line so it gets done.

Ms. Chandler: How long do you think?

Mr. Hutaff: Twenty-four hours? ...(inaudible)... they should have an inventory.

Chair Fredericksen: That shouldn't be something super difficult. Stanley, what are your thoughts on something like that?

Mr. Solamillo: On an inventory?

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, just -- I mean very, very broad brush strokes, but just -- 'cause what you're looking for, I'm assuming, is just, well, hey, how many buildings does DAGS have jurisdiction over that are over 50 years old, and then, B, where are they? And I don't know if there's anything else; C, if they've got a function for them.

Mr. Solamillo: I want a photograph, a TMK, an address, and the year of construction.

Mr. Hutaff: So if we were to ask you for that information about something you had in your inventory, how long would it take you to get that?

Mr. Solamillo: If I had to make it up from scratch --

Chair Fredericksen: What's a polite --

Ms. Chandler: Amount of time?

Chair Fredericksen: Amount of time? Yeah, maybe if DAGS -- could you come back up? Thanks. We're just trying to get --

Mr. Victor: We have an inventory of all the land that's I guess EO'd to DAGS. All state land is basically under DLNR and then the governor EO's --

Chair Fredericksen: Executive order.

Mr. Victor: Yeah. Parcels to other agencies. For example, he would executive order school land to the DOE and land to be used for offices to DAGS. There's not a lot of land that we have and not a whole lot of buildings that we have - old buildings that we have. The DOE has a whole ton of them but, as far as DAGS is concerned, you know, off the top of my head, maybe under ten buildings.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, so two months should certainly be enough time to have the inventory of those buildings just with very basic information - TMK, and a photo, and where it is?

Ms. Chandler: I have a question about that.

Mr. Osako: You update it from time to time?

Ms. Chandler: Is -- if a building is occupied by a by a state agency, and then they leave, is it turned over to the DAGS after that? Okay, so we would get a listing of only the property and buildings that you control at this moment, but not a listing of the state occupied buildings over 50 years old?

Mr. Victor: Yes. That's correct.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. See that's what, I think, we probably want more because, right now, DAGS doesn't have it in their purview, right? But it's coming when DOE pulls out or, you know, when --

Mr. Victor: No. If DOE pulls out, it reverts back to DLNR so --

Ms. Chandler: Like for this property, is that how you got it? It's a DOE property?

Chair Fredericksen: No. DOE is on a portion of it.

Ms. Chandler: It's DOE land?

Chair Fredericksen: Is the whole thing DOE or?

Mr. Victor: It was -- part of it was DOE and part of it was A&B, and when they started planning for the six-story office building, DAGS acquired both parcels, so it's currently under DAGS.

Chair Fredericksen: So the parcels are owned by the state, per se, or DLNR?

Mr. Victor: Well, this parcel and several other parcels, but not -- not a whole lot, and there's not a whole lot of buildings over 50 years old.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Yes, Stanley?

Mr. Solamillo: Just in the record, this is a question for Victor, is it fair to say that when DOE decides to relocate a campus or abandoned a school, does it then give it to your department to liquidate, and is your department in charge of the liquidation of buildings 50 years of age and over?

Mr. Victor: If DOE or another agency abandons a parcel, it reverts back to DLNR.

Chair Fredericksen: So, if there's a building on the parcel, or let's say there's a parcel and they don't want to -- they still wanna use the land for something, but if there's a building on it, they don't wanna use the building, what happens, DAGS get involved at that point, or nothing, if it's a different state agency?

Mr. Victor: We could get involved. A lot of times the agencies come through us because we have the staff to --

Chair Fredericksen: Right. The engineering ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Victor: The engineers, architects, planners. That sort of stuff. So it would be up to the agency to do it on their own. Some of the larger agencies, like DOT, have their own engineering staff so they would probably do it on their own. But most of the smaller agencies, like DHS or Health Department, or, you know, they come through DAGS to do the either demolition or reconstruction or repair.

Chair Fredericksen: Do the analysis, basically, and then figure out where does it go from here.

Mr. Victor: Yes.

Chair Fredericksen: Here's a question for you. In your, 'cause I'm not -- I was a state employee a long time ago but I have been out of the state for a very long time, from our perspective as a Commission, as the Cultural Resources Commission, one of our -- one of the things under our purview is what -- you know, the old building, trying to help ensure that they just don't -- we don't get the demolition permits only, we get more of the adaptive reuse permit applications, how, in your mind, could we come up -- could one come up with an inventory of buildings that are out there that are under state jurisdiction, under state control, that are over 50 years old? 'Cause it sounds like it's a gray area. I mean DOE, and then some of the smaller agencies, have some buildings that are over 50 years old,

nobody knows how many, but once it gets to a point where they can't deal with them anymore, then they provide them to DAGS and say, hey, you know, see ya. You know, they don't wanna -- and then DAGS, at that point, has kinda been handed a problem. It's like, well, here's this old building that, you know, hasn't been used for a while, or whatever the case may be, and it's in disrepair, etcetera, then it, basically, goes into a demolition by neglect situation. We're just looking at it from the point of view as is there a way we could be more proactive 'cause this has been -- I've been on the Commission, this is my, come next month, this my last one on this one, that makes two five-year terms, I've been on here a decade with one year out and this has just been -- it's just reruns all the time for me, these buildings get to a certain point, and that's what it is, demolition. So what do you think in terms of, from what I heard you just say recently, DAGS doesn't have a whole lot of buildings in its -- the buildings that it has direct jurisdiction over at this point, maybe you mentioned less than ten and you're, you know, just kinda off the top of your head, but is that it? I mean what else is out there? How could that inventory be acquired?

Mr. Victor: I'd probably go through Historic Preservation, you know, and they, in turn, could go through the DLNR Land Division 'cause all the executive orders are with the land division so they, from there, could see all the state executive orders, you know, what parcels of land are with what agencies.

Chair Fredericksen: Now, when it's a parcel of land, does it -- how clear is the communication that, okay, there's three buildings, let's say, on this one parcel or is it just like, well, we got 35 parcels but not sure if there's buildings on them or not?

Mr. Victor: It's, you know, it's not going to jump right out at you. It's going to take a lot of work so I would go through Historic Preservation, through DLNR Land Division, and look at all the executive orders and, for example, DOE, if there's an executive order to DOE, you know that's the school, and then you'd have to go through the individual departments and ask what their building inventory is. It's a daunting task, you know. DOE has, you know, 30-something schools, and each school has, you know, anywhere from 10 to 30 buildings on it, so --

Chair Fredericksen: Okay.

Mr. Victor: It'll take some doing to get all that information.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. In the - just one second - in the meantime though, we would want DAGS to provide the inventory of whatever happens to be in DAGS -- under DAGS's purview, not right this second.

Mr. Victor: Yeah. That would be doable.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. And now our Deputy Director has some input.

Ms. McLean: I'm wondering if it might be easier and faster if, essentially, the identical request was made to three main state agencies: to DLNR, DOE, and DAGS, and just say we would like an inventory of your buildings in Maui County that are 50 years old or more, you know. We're writing to you because we keep seeing these things that are just neglected over time. We wanna nip these in the bud. We'd like to know if you have a maintenance program. And start with those three. And there may be some, you know, and as time goes on, maybe we'll say, oh, well let's also write to these guys, let's also write to these guys, but those are probably the three main ones and just have each of them responsible for the buildings under their jurisdiction.

Ms. Thomson: Can I add something to that? I don't know if you'd wanna ask for this information at the same time or after you receive the inventory, and then, you know, discuss and see what other further information, but you can presumably ask for what management strategies they have for, you know, like you were saying maintenance schedules and all. But for buildings specifically over 50 years old, is there anything special that they do so that you can provide them information.

Mr. Hutaff: I think it's a great idea but I think we should ask for the inventory first because that sort of takes the spot. We get one, then ask for the other. But that's brilliant.

Ms. Sarich: I just have another question for Victor. Has your agency ever restored a building, a historic building?

Mr. Victor: We have for a school. The DOE has come to us and said let's, you know, let's renovate buildings, and we've done quite a few; most of them are older concrete buildings where it's, you know, the problems with termite infestation are not that bad, you know. There may be some but that can be taken care of. So we've done that quite a bit. We've also done a few wooden buildings and it's a nightmare because although the damage is not evident, when the architect prepares his plans and specs, he can find some damage, but once you start replacing boards and stuff, more damage becomes evident. So in answer to your question, yes. We've done quite a few and the concrete buildings come out pretty nice. Wooden buildings, it's just a nightmare because there's so much hidden damage and the change orders on the project just goes like out of control, so we prefer -- you know, and this is why we want these demolished because we've been there, done that. Structurally, if the building is compromised by termite damage, you get to a certain point where it's more cost effective just to tear the thing down and reconstruct -- I mean rebuild 'cause with wooden buildings, it's a big unknown, I mean doing the renovation just 'cause there's a lot of hidden damage.



Ms. Sarich: Thank you. And then when you do reconstructions, are you employing an architect to help to make sure that the buildings are still eligible for National Historic Register or is that not part of it, they just need to be functional?

Mr. Victor: I don't remember. Usually schools are not -- I think we've done a couple of schools, maybe Pa`ia and Baldwin maybe that are -- so, basically, the integrity of the building is kept the same, especially the exterior, yeah, they got the same type of wood -- I mean roofs, same type of windows, and then the interior is altered quite a bit to come up to current times - ADA standards. In the old days they used to have like maybe two or three electrical outlets for classrooms, you know, now, you need a lot. You need like 15, you know, with the computers and audio/visual equipment and stuff. So exterior we keep the buildings pretty much the same. Interior, the room sizes pretty much remain the same, but they're all updated.

Ms. Sarich: Thank you.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other questions, comments? Okay, thanks. Okay, now, going back, I think we're back to our motion, which I forgot. Stan, did you take notes?

Ms. McLean: It's probably better to separate them into two motions; one for the matter at hand on the agenda, and then the other making the request to the agencies for the inventory.

Mr. Solamillo: Okay, for Building E at Kahului, the CRC does not recommend demolition. The CRC wishes or recommends that DAGS explore additional possibilities and uses, including rental to for-profits, non-profits, and even relocation if necessary. The CRC further recommends that DAGS provide proof or provide documentation that such alternatives have been researched before coming back for demolition.

Chair Fredericksen: Rhiannon?

Ms. Chandler: Stan, did you say "new location?"

Mr. Solamillo: Including relocation.

Ms. Chandler: So I think we're just going to scratch that part but the rest of it is all the motion.

Mr. Hutaff: I second it.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

*It has been moved by Ms. Chandler, seconded by Mr. Hutaff, then unanimously*

**VOTED:** *that, for Building E at Kahului, the CRC does not recommend demolition. The CRC wishes or recommends that DAGS explore additional possibilities and uses, including rental to for-profits and non-profits. The CRC further recommends that DAGS provide proof or provide documentation that such alternatives have been researched before coming back for demolition.*

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, motion carries. Now, for the second motion, this is dealing with the Commission's request, and I like what the Deputy Director said, let's send it to the three biggest agencies to start off with: DAGS, DOE, and DLNR, and that would be requesting --

Ms. Chandler: Don't we have a Health Department too?

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Ms. Chandler: Just start with those four.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, because that's another one that's out there.

Ms. Chandler: ...(inaudible)... building.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. Yeah, that's --

Mr. Solamillo: Those are the buildings at Puko`o.

Chair Fredericksen: Yep. Those are the big four to start off with. So a Commission Member want to get that one out on the floor?

Mr. Hutaff: Okay, I move that we send the request to agencies discussed, having them give us an inventory of any buildings that they have in their inventory older than 50 years.

Chair Fredericksen: All buildings.

Mr. Hutaff: All buildings, not just old buildings?

Chair Fredericksen: All buildings over 50 years old.

Mr. Hutaff: All buildings over 50 years old, and cc the Maui County.

Chair Fredericksen: And I think also SHPD.

Ms. McLean: That would be under DLNR.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. But still, as the reviewing agency, 'cause it'll get redirected somewhere, but just so that SHPD's aware that this is going on. Yeah. Okay?

Mr. Osako: I second.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay.

Ms. McLean: Did you wanna put a requested time frame? Someone had suggested a time frame.

Ms. Sarich: Oh yeah. Good idea.

Ms. McLean: Ask for it within --

Mr. Osako: Sixty days.

Ms. Sarich: That's tough. Ninety days?

Mr. Osako: Ninety days.

Mr. Hutaff: Ninety days.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Is that added to the motion? Okay. Is there a second?

Mr. Osako: Second.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

***It has been moved by Mr. Hutaff, seconded by Mr. Osako, then unanimously***

***VOTED: that the CRC send a request to the State DLNR, DAGS, DOE, and DOH, having them submit an inventory within 90 days of all buildings that they have in their inventory older than 50 years, and that a copy be submitted to the County of Maui and SHPD.***

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, motion carries. That'll be an important first step. Thank you to the DAGS rep. for coming and being a good sport. We weren't trying to get all over you. Okay, next item.

*Mr. Solamillo read the following item description into the record:*

## **F. CORRESPONDENCE**

- 1. MR. STANLEY SOLAMILLO, on behalf of the MAUI COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT, requesting comments and recommendations on the FORMER JUDICIARY BUILDING (COURTHOUSE) AND MAUI COUNTY JAIL, subject to Demolition by Neglect, located at Malama Cultural Park, TMK 5-3-001:005 and TMK 5-3-001:002, Kaunakakai, Island of Moloka'i, Hawai'i. The CRC may provide comments and recommendations. Public testimony will be accepted. *This item was deferred by the CRC on January 5, 2012. (S. Solamillo)***

Mr. Solamillo: Okay, we took a tour on our Moloka'i CRC meeting and actually visited these two buildings, and earlier today, we looked at photographs of the buildings at their earlier sites. And actually, Kaunakakai was the site of two jails at one time. There was actually a jail located -- no, that is the government lot, but there was a second jail. There was actually supposed to be two jails before the jail that was built at Puko'o actually made its way to Kaunakakai. And we're familiar with this site we had just looked at that was pictured in 1927. And then we have a red arrow showing the jail behind the courthouse in this 1937 shot. And then because it is a jail and we did have Japanese on the island, it gains a little bit more importance because it gets covered under Hawai'i confinement sites, and Lana'i also has two, and there's still come debate, I've recently received claims from people from Hana that they never confined any Japanese in Hana, but I don't know. We'll have to see.

Mr. Hutaff: Hasegawa?

Mr. Solamillo: Don't know. The importance for the confinement of Japanese is brought forward by the Honouliuli Special Resource Study, which was undertaken by the National Park Service last year, and it was funded by or after the efforts of Senator Inouye, who brought money, over a million dollars, to do this study. They finally began looking at the internees from Hawai'i because this was a population of some -- I think it's like over 2,000 Japanese from Hawai'i whose histories hadn't yet been documented, and we're still trying to piece together what exactly happened later in the day on December 7, and during the first part of 1942. That's Senator Inouye, who would -- brought a lot of attention to this, and the study, I think, isn't completed yet but will be shortly. And if you go to the Mainland,

internment is a really big issue. Here it's not. And it's still, I believe, a source of shame for many families, and coupled with that, there was the significant loss of property by order of the military governor, and that is another area of research that has yet to be conducted in the outer islands.

What we have gathered together or just bits and pieces is a letter from an internee to love ones from Sand Island, actually, before he gets shipped to the Mainland. These are locations of camps where Hawa`i internees were sent. This I showed you last time of a sample of FBI case write-up for one individual, who the agents surmised at the time, that we do not see how this man can ever become loyal to the United States of America, and we do not believe that his children will ever be brought up as Americans. And we know from history that that's, in those case, blatantly false. The four known families who were interned in the jail at Kaunakakai were Kozen Nishizawa, Shigeto Tagashima, Shigeko Tami, and Masutaro Teraoku. Reverend Nishizawa was sent to Sand Island, then to the U.S. Mainland, and then to Jerome, and he was accompanied, later accompanied by his wife and daughters. After the war, they did not return to Maui County; they went to Kauai.

So when we visited the two buildings in question, the jail in particular was the worse looking one. The jail doors had been torn off. There was a live beehive in one end, and you couldn't walk near the building without the bees starting to swarm around your head. Because of the conditions of that building, it became imperative that we needed to do something. So my immediate concern was to get the building under closure, and I don't know whether that happened or not, and I probably doubt it, and then the next thing is to actually probably initiate mitigation just because we don't know what's going to happen, it's in this limbo of discussion of what happens to the government buildings at Kaunakakai, but this too has sat, you got what? 20 years? So at first we thought it was 10; no, it's 20. And it's really, really, really unfortunate. That's all I can say --

So I'm asking you today, I wanna initiate some correspondence, and part of our needs are being addressed by the inventory, and then as Glen kinda flushed out all the property issues that exist for buildings down at Malama Cultural Park; who owns them? Who owns the buildings? That sort of thing. But if you agree at least that we attempt to get the buildings under closure and then begin mitigation, then I will put RFBs out for this project.

Chair Fredericksen: Stanley, a question regarding the buildings in jeopardy on Moloka`i. Has the Council Member, Danny Mateo, is he aware of all of this?

Mr. Solamillo: I don't know because I am not in contact with council members.

Chair Fredericksen: Wait. I'm sorry?

Mr. Solamillo: I'm not in contact with council members so --

Chair Fredericksen: Maybe that might be an idea for us, as a Commission, to send a letter expressing our concern about these buildings and the fact that they are certainly threatened. They've been -- and maybe, along those lines, indicating that, you know, the integrity's somewhat compromised because they've been moved but they are locally very significant buildings because of the history association with local history.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. I would say that this is one case where it doesn't matter if it's been moved or cut in half or, you know, in this case they haven't been, but even if they had been, the testimony that we got from the people you could tell that the jail and courthouse were just so significant; it doesn't matter where they reside, they'll always be significant.

Mr. Hutaff: Maybe even let Danny know that there's a beehive there that needs to be dispatched regardless -- regardless of what happens, okay, those bees need to go yesterday.

Mr. Solamillo: They need to have a home.

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah.

Chair Fredericksen: Well, on this one, or with these two buildings, in light of what the bulk of the meeting's been about today, we need to take some proactive steps on these two because that's just a matter of time before the demolition permits for those come. So what's the Commission's thoughts on maybe potentially drafting a letter to the at least the chair, according to Deputy Director over here, I did know that of us getting a letter --

Ms. Chandler: Of the council.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, so I think that would be somebody very important to get some of this information to.

Ms. Sarich: Who writes this letter? Stanley?

Chair Fredericksen: But it would be, basically, a Commission letter of our, you know, the Commission's request to, you know, what can be done about this 'cause this is going to be an issue and note -- reference what happened today with that one building that's, you know, that's going to be going bye-bye, that's half, most likely, that's the concern.

Ms. Chandler: We could say something like while the residents recognize the cultural and historical significance of the building, the place where it sits right now is compromising it further and it's putting it in jeopardy of being demolished as that park plan evolves, so it's becoming more urgent.

Chair Fredericksen: Both of them.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. But I think that's the best thing to do is to start with Councilman Mateo, and, in fact, if we did anything other than start there, that might be not as nice, you know, so start with him and then maybe if we could send a transmission back to us, we're still ahead of the game because we don't have any demolition permits in front of us right now.

Mr. Hutaff: Has anybody thought about maybe trying to get in contact with some of the magistrates and see if they'd have a voice in the keeping of this --

Chair Fredericksen: Probably not.

Mr. Hutaff: You think that's a good idea?

Chair Fredericksen: Probably so.

Mr. Hutaff: I like his "probably."

Chair Fredericksen: The challenge is, you know, who's named what ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Hutaff: Well, I'm looking at some of the dates, appointed in '56; that's not long ago. And Hasegawa, there, you know, should be --

Chair Fredericksen; Some folks certainly could still be --

Mr. Hutaff: Some folks are going to be easy to find and they might even know other, you know, family members and stuff because, you know, certainly if there was something that I did later on and it was proven to be important, which it never will, okay, and I would certainly like somebody to contact my family and go, hey, do you think this is important with your name on it? You know, that might be a resource. Who knows? Some of these might have ties to money to accomplish that in their own name.

Chair Fredericksen: So for first -- our first step in the direction on this road, I think, might be best served is to get that letter to Councilman Mateo, and then maybe pursuing something like that.

Ms. Chandler: And so we're asking for other available property on Moloka'i, and maybe informing him of what the testimony that we received was, including that it could be a potential museum in the future if it fell into the right group's, nonprofit probably, hands?

Chair Fredericksen: do you have the name of the person who was particularly interested in those buildings at the meeting over there?

Mr. Solamillo: Arleone Dibbin-Young.

Chair Fredericksen: Could that person be copied that letter perhaps, and then --

Mr. Solamillo: And she's the one who wrote the letter -- wrote, the next day, letters to the governor and the senators and --

Chair Fredericksen: Did anything go to council -- Councilman Mateo?

Mr. Solamillo: I have no idea because all she asked me for was parts of the powerpoint. That's all I furnished.

Chair Fredericksen: Maybe -- I think it would be a good idea to copy her, and if she still has that interest, at least know that there's someone else -- I mean at the county level, that would be the most appropriate council member.

Ms. Chandler: Lori Buchanan was with us too. I think she gave testimony for these buildings as well, but she's not ...(inaudible)... the way that this other woman is, but I definitely think that there's more people that --

Chair Fredericksen: Which at least give her some ammunition out there so maybe something can get going a little further along.

Ms. Thomson: Or you could copy the entire Molokai Planning Commission, if you want to, rather than just one commission member.

Ms. Chandler: Oh, that's right. She's a commissioner.

Chair Fredericksen: Oh. Yeah.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, certainly, the Molokai Planning Commission. Thanks, Richele.

Ms. McLean: And we can also just internally bring this to the mayor's attention.

Chair Fredericksen: Good.



Ms. McLean: Especially if there's like current work that needs to be done, the beehive, and other things to secure the building in the short-term, in the immediate short-term, that's something we can bring to the mayor's attention.

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah, I contacted the Bug Man. They were willing to do it. They didn't give me a price or anything. But they need permission --

Chair Fredericksen: Right.

Mr. Hutaff: From the owner of the building and the property owner.

Chair Fredericksen: Which is two different entities. It may or may not be known and it's like, oh, my goodness. Okay.

Ms. Sarich: And then I really think we should ask for the HABS Level 1 documentation on both buildings in case something does happen to them.

Chair Fredericksen: How could we frame something like that?

Mr. Solamillo: How can we frame -- we just make a recommendation -- this Commission makes a recommendation for HABS mitigation to initiate. I'll start putting together an RFB.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Thank you, Stanley.

Mr. Solamillo: And then we'll see if we can get a split with Certified Local Government funds. Okay. I mean, literally, guys, we're the only ones -- I don't think, maybe a little bit in Honolulu, but I don't think in the outer islands no one's doing much about the internees or -- everybody wants to, you know, forget it, you know.

Chair Fredericksen: It's part of the history.

Mr. Solamillo: It's really quite important.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Mr. Hutaff: What's really cool is that this building is almost identical to what's in place in Hana.

Mr. Solamillo: Hana. Correct.

Mr. Hutaff: You know, they're a twin, basically. And Maui County and -- you know, Moloka'i is part of Maui County. There's a whole lot of, yeah, whole lot of significance. And they still use that for a court in Hana.

Ms. Sarich: Do they use it for a jail?

Mr. Hutaff: No. They've attempted.

Ms. Sarich: Wow.

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah, well, some of the drunks have been trying to be thrown in before by residents but, you know --

Chair Fredericksen: They were able to crawl out the next day after they woke up.

Mr. Hutaff: No. They don't use the jail. Even the bathroom, they get the sign on the bathroom over there, it's not even used ...(inaudible)... actually, I did take one of our employees and give testimony in that court about four years ago.

Chair Fredericksen: We had a Commission meeting there once.

Mr. Hutaff: Really?

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. My first term. It was pretty cool.

Mr. Hutaff: It is really cool.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. Any other thoughts on this -- the courthouse and the jail at Kaunakakai at this point? At least go through that effort of getting it to the -- 'cause he is the chair of the council at this point.

Mr. Osako: And then, yeah, you know, we bring it to the attention of ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Mr. Osako: See if it's going to come up.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. It will and let's get proactive about it, especially with this first one, which is -- if it's, you know, that's the sacrifice that allows for the greater good, so be it.

Mr. Osako: And if or when they get their permit ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, they're going to wanna move forward. Yeah, they'll wanna move forward.

Mr. Hutaff: Actually, they said they could walk around it ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: But they will, eventually. They'll eventually wanna move forward. Stanley, of the two structures, the jailhouse looked like it was in sadder condition. Has anything come up about this at all? Nothing? It's just --

Mr. Solamillo: What do you mean nothing?

Chair Fredericksen: About demolition, anything like that?

Mr. Solamillo: No.

Chair Fredericksen: No.

Mr. Solamillo: My biggest concern was when the doors are off the building --

Chair Fredericksen: Right.

Mr. Solamillo: That means the kids can get in --

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Mr. Solamillo: And you've got all sorts of problems, and it's like we're liable.

Chair Fredericksen: Right.

Mr. Solamillo: that's ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Hutaff: We're liable meaning who?

Mr. Solamillo: The county.

Mr. Osako: It's on county property.

Mr. Solamillo: Well, it's actually not. It's on state property. Technically, in the book it says, "state." If the improvement's on state land, it's state. But you know how people are.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Mr. Solamillo: You know ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Hutaff: I think securing the place is something the county and the state gotta look for ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Solamillo: The jail went to state land. The courthouse went to county land.

Ms. Kanuha: One here; one there.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Mr. Solamillo: I mean it's like come on.

Mr. Hutaff: Somebody said go left.

Ms. Sarich: I would just like to reassert what I said earlier that I think that even if this is associated with a negative part of history, that the physical evidence is that it's so important.

Chair Fredericksen: Oh yeah.

Mr. Hutaff: It's all -- and I don't even think that it's even that negative. You know, history is just that. We talk about history. History are our lessons, good and bad. And the good lessons we perpetuate; the bad lessons we go don't do that again. And so we need all of it.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Mr. Hutaff: Always. And plus, remember, we don't want someone deciding that our history is not important.

Chair Fredericksen: Well let's go ahead and put a formal motion together for the letter to get this letter off to Councilman Mateo and maybe -- and copied to others.

Mr. Osako: I move that we have this letter forwarded to Councilman Mateo, to copy Molokai Planning Commission --

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Mr. Osako: And also, I forget the name, but the woman --

Chair Fredericksen: The interested party.

Mr. Osako: Party, yeah. So that she has a heads-up that, you know, there might be a time line on this because it's going to come up and --

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, given this item -- item A -- no, excuse me, item E, no. 1, that already -- that we took up today.

Mr. Osako: So we should notify these parties. I don't know, anybody else do we wanna -- DLNR was on the list.

Mr. Solamillo: DLNR's position on these buildings was that they were moved. They are not eligible for listing.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. And this is ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Osako: No, no, but because of the local historic -- they don't care?

Mr. Solamillo: No. No.

Mr. Hutaff: How about if we --

Mr. Solamillo: Heiau yeah; buildings no.

Mr. Hutaff: We still can discuss your motion?

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. We haven't -- it hasn't been seconded.

Mr. Hutaff: Why don't we cc the canoe club, people from Malama Park, so they know that we're moving in that direction?

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. That's a good call for sure.

Ms. Sarich: And then Planning will let the mayor know about the bees and that we need to close the doors and make it ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Solamillo: Okay. Second?

Ms. Kanuha: I second.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

***It has been moved by Mr. Osako, seconded by Ms. Kanuha, then unanimously***

**VOTED:**     ***that a letter be sent from the CRC to Councilman Mateo and that copies be sent to those that were discussed, and also that the Planning Department will inform the Mayor about the bees and that the doors need to be closed on the building.***

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Motion carries for the letter.

Mr. Solamillo: Okay. Director's Report. The Chair --

Ms. Sarich: Do we need --

Mr. Solamillo: I'm sorry.

Chair Fredericksen: Go ahead.

Ms. Sarich: The HABS is all done? We don't need a motion for that?

Mr. Solamillo: Oh, you can. Yeah, I'm sorry. You should do a motion for a HABS Level 1.

Chair Fredericksen: What was that again, Brandis? Oh, to get --

Mr. Solamillo: HABS Level 1.

Chair Fredericksen: To get some information on this.

Ms. Sarich: Yeah.

Chair Fredericksen: Good. Thank you for remembering that.

Ms. Sarich: I move that we recommend to have HABS Level 1 documentation for both the jail and the courthouse buildings.

Mr. Osako: Second.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

***It has been moved by Ms. Sarich, seconded by Mr. Osako, then unanimously***

**VOTED:**     ***that the CRC recommend to have HABS Level 1 documentation for both the jail and the courthouse buildings.***

Chair Fredericksen: Motion carries. Thank you for remembering that.

## **G. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

### **1. Status Report on the Proposed Amendments to Maui County Code, Chapters 2.88 and 19.48-19.52, which were transmitted to the Maui County Council on April 20, 2011**

Mr. Solamillo: Okay, under Director's Report, several months back, Chair Fredericksen and Commission Sarich requested a status on -- actually, a report on the proposed amendments to Maui County Code, Chapters 2.88 and 19.48 to 19.52, which had been transmitted earlier to the Maui County Council on April 20, 2011. You all received copies of this in your mailout. Did you read it? Do you have any questions?

Ms. Sarich: My only question was the whole idea of the professional, that organization be made up of professionals. I just wanna make sure that that actually came through the way that we intended.

Mr. Hutaff: The statement was made.

Ms. Sarich: I think that, on page 2, item C, we said the majority of the commission members shall be professionals in the disciplines of archaeology, planning, architecture or architecture history, or Hawaiian culture or history. And Bruce was actually the one who had the biggest issue with that, I think, and he's not here, but I just wanna make sure that sounds good to everybody; that we are calling cultural practitioners "professionals" for this.

Chair Fredericksen: Oh yeah. And I do remember that and was that Bruce's concern was that that would potentially cut out some folks in the Hawaiian community that are -- have abundant knowledge but don't seek out to be paid for that to be excluded, so, yeah, we wanna be real careful with the -- that term "professional."

Ms. Kanuha: Yeah. And I know he -- 'cause there's some kupuna or some cultural people, they didn't go to college to learn all the knowledge that they have today. This is the knowledge that passed down by their kupuna, by their parents, and, you know, so I think that's where that came in ...(inaudible)...

Chair Fredericksen: So the, whatever you wanna call it, the professional label does not or should not apply.

Mr. Hutaff: It should say "knowledgeable."

Mr. Osako: ...(inaudible)... majority. Majority is five out of nine.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah.

Ms. Chandler: Oh yeah.

Mr. Osako: ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Sarich: Okay.

Mr. Hutaff: It also should be “knowledgeable,” you know, which indicates they have to kinda prove it a little bit ...(inaudible)... our knowledge is passed from thousands of years.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other comments?

Ms. Sarich: So we’re happy with it or we wanna change it to shall be “professional” or “knowledgeable?”

Chair Fredericksen: Brandis, I’m sorry. Where was that again?

Ms. Sarich: Page 2, item C.

Chair Fredericksen: Oh, that’s the summary.

Ms. McLean: I’d like to comment on that. These have already been transmitted to the Council; that’s not to say that the Commission can’t send a followup letter that provides additional comments, or whenever the council schedules this, the Commission could provide specific testimony at that time.

Ms. Sarich: Okay. Thank you. So I guess my only question for the rest of you is should we add the “professionals” or “demonstrate knowledge” in these areas?

Mr. Solamillo: Can you go back to the tail-end of the document, and in smaller print, page 2, in the right-hand column it has comments, change by CRC and read the actual comments.

Ms. Sarich: Oh, thank you.

Mr. Solamillo: Maybe that will answer your question.

Ms. Sarich: Oh, so this is what it will be changed to?



Chair Fredericksen: Oh, we were looking at the draft.

Mr. Solamillo: I don't know, and I'd have to ask the Deputy Director what relationship is this --

Ms. Sarich: Okay. That is what we wanted in there.

Mr. Solamillo: Right, but what relationship does this have to what's been transmitted since it's part of this huge packet that went to council.

Ms. Chandler: So, Stanley, they know in council that they're looking at this one and not the first --

Mr. Solamillo: See, I don't know.

Ms. Chandler: Okay. That's what I'd be worried about because I agree. It shouldn't be "professional" and if they might at all interpret the first part to mean this is the final recommendation.

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, the cultural practitioner --

Ms. Chandler: Because it's so -- it is, you know, outlined in this second exhibit.

Mr. Solamillo: But bear in mind that the National Park Service has requirements which have that professional component.

Chair Fredericksen: For a cultural practitioner?

Mr. Solamillo: No.

Chair Fredericksen: No.

Mr. Solamillo: Just for architects, archaeologists; there's a whole group of professionals but not cultural practitioner.

Chair Fredericksen: But not cultural practitioner. What we wanna do is make sure that the cultural practitioner doesn't inadvertently get lumped into that so --

Mr. Solamillo: Correct.

Chair Fredericksen: So --

Ms. Chandler: Because, actually, it says “professionals and persons,” so that’s okay because then the part we wanted to change was “with special interests” instead of “special interests,” to change “demonstrated experience,” so it could be “persons with demonstrated experience.”

Mr. Solamillo: Right.

Ms. Chandler: With Hawaiian culture and then it would still be true.

Chair Fredericksen” Where’s that?

Ms. Chandler: On Exhibit 2. It’s actually towards the end.

Ms. Sarich: Page 2.

Ms. Chandler: Page 2.

Chair Fredericksen: Page 2. I’m looking at page 2 with bullets on it. Is this further up?

Mr. Solamillo: It’s at the back.

Chair Fredericksen: This one? This page 2?

Mr. Hutaff: That looks like it with comments on the side.

Ms. Chander: How come yours are on a different page than mine?

Chair Fredericksen: I don’t know.

Ms. McLean: Okay. I think I can explain what all these documents are.

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah.

Ms. McLean: Okay. The first page is a letter from the Planning Department sending it up to council. Next we have the memo from the Planning Director, Kathleen Aoki, to the three planning commissions, and attached to that memo is Exhibit 1, which is the resolution, and Exhibit A, which is the bill that the council sent to the three planning commissions.

Chair Fredericksen: To look over.

Ms. McLean: And that’s the one that doesn’t have any of those little comments on the side. Then Exhibit 2 was also sent to the three planning commissions and that was the CRC’s

comments on the bill. So the CRC reviewed the bill before the three planning commissions. So -- and then there are the maps of the historic districts. And then the last document actually contains the CRC plus the three planning commission's comments all in one document. So you have the original bill; then you have one that just has the CRC's comments; then you have one that has all of the comments. Too much information sometimes. So council does have those comments.

Ms. Chandler: I guess our question is: Are they going to look there? You know, I mean 'cause really it's -- I know how hard that is for them on the floor, you know, and they're going to -- the first one, it just might get overlooked, and it's kind of an important word.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay, here's my question. On -- I think this is under Exhibit 2, it's the next page after Exhibit 4, where it has all the - whatever those things are called - okay, now the large one, it says, "Comment: Qualification should be academic degree in science, such as architecture, archaeology, natural resource management, geology, and ecology. As well as Hawaiian cultural specialist. Recommended: MoPC." What is that?

Ms. McLean: That's the Moloka'i Planning Commission. That comment was a comment from the Moloka'i Planning Commission. "MoPC" is our abbreviation for the Moloka'i Planning Commission.

Chair Fredericksen: So, the way I'm looking at it is "As well as Hawaiian cultural specialist" that's something else other than the academic stuff for the ones above?

Ms. McLean: That's how I would read it. That the Moloka'i Planning Commission separated like an academic degree in the sciences as opposed to being a specialist in Hawaiian culture.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Yes. And I would agree with that. Although I kinda like the term "cultural practitioner," but that's --

Ms. Maluo: I'd like to agree with that. I think "specialist" is a different term from "practitioner."

Mr. Hutaff: Unfortunately, we can't change the Moloka'i's recommendation.

Ms. Chandler: But we could maybe comment in a letter to the council. That would be one way.

Ms. McLean: If you want to supplement the comments that you've already offered --

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. And the -- maybe we could just add, you know, Maui -- you know, the CRC recommends "Hawaiian cultural specialist" but that the "cultural practitioner" also be included within that. Did we have "cultural practitioner" anywhere else?

Ms. McLean: It looks as if your comment said, "professionals and persons with demonstrated experience in the following disciplines," and among those disciplines is "Hawaiian culture." And then in letter C, Hawaiian history -- or, excuse me, "Hawaiian culture or history." So getting away from that adding an addition to being a professional, it can be a person with demonstrated experience in.

Chair Fredericksen: I just wanna make sure that the cultural practitioners are not inadvertently excluded because that would not be good. Does everyone on the Commission feel comfortable with the wording as it sits with that?

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah, actually. As far as what Moloka`i wanted as far as the specialist or not even a practitioner, I think we kinda cover it here where it says where she said after this discipline, architecture history, archaeology, planning, archaeology history, Hawaiian culture, ethnic history, and the culture of Maui, you know, demonstrated experience, I think, you know --

Chair Fredericksen: Just so it doesn't narrow the opportunity inadvertently.

Mr. Hutaff: I think it actually opens it up because it says, "demonstrated experience," which means you don't have to have a degree attached to that.

Chair Fredericksen: Right, which, in a lot of cases, is completely -- it's not, well, appropriate or whatever.

Ms. Chandler: I think the part that just throws us off is that Exhibit A, which is the first thing people are going to read just still reads as "special interest." So how --

Ms. McLean: When it comes to something like this, when the council generates a bill that they send out, they know when it comes back to them they're going to be looking at the comments.

Ms. Chandler: Oh good.

Ms. McLean: So if they looked at just that first bill in the packet, they'd be like where are the comments? Because this first bill is -- these are just what we call "housekeeping changes," and they'd wanna know what the comments are.

Ms. Chandler: Okay, great. So then maybe it doesn't require another letter.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other comments? Brandis?

Ms. Sarich: Stanley, how many professionals do we need to have for recognition from the Federal Government, like people ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Solamillo: One archeologist; one architect; one historian.

Ms. Sarich: And we don't have those people. We have -- do we?

Mr. Solamillo: Yeah.

Ms. Sarich: Oh we do? Oh, okay.

Mr. Solamillo: You're a registered architect. He's a registered archeologist. Historian, I think we're hurting for a historian.

Ms. Kanuha: I feel like a historian ...(inaudible)... old.

Mr. Solamillo: Alright, you're the historian. And then we've got -- we have lots of cultural practitioners. I mean we're fine.

Ms. Sarich: Okay.

Mr. Solamillo: We will be hurting, in a month, for an archaeologist so -- okay. That's it?

Chair Fredericksen: Any other comments? Okay.

Mr. Solamillo: Okay.

Ms. Thomson: Are you still on this item? You haven't left it yet? Commissioner Chandler brought up Historic District No. 3 adding some delineated special uses, such as professional uses that we saw with the one application today.

Ms. Chandler: I think that we had agreed that health and wellness should be allowable in the district, and so I know that that might be a code change or something new, but we should explore that because we should not be the position that we were in today with the chiropractor.

Chair Fredericksen: Thank you for the recall on ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Hutaff: Is there a way that we could just say like "other" ...(inaudible)... no, because, you know --

Chair Fredericksen: On a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Thomson: You've already got it.

Mr. Hutaff: ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Thomson: Well, you have "other uses that will enhance the historical and cultural nature of this district" in -- just in District 3 you're talking about. Districts 1 and 2 have kinda a longer laundry list.

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah, 'cause, obviously, if we add to, somebody else would come in and have a similar -- a different business or a different entity will go, well, that one should be too. If we could just open it up to where others approved by or recommended by the Cultural Resources for approval, then that means every time it comes through, we just make a decision right then and there.

Ms. McLean: That is what you did today.

Mr. Hutaff: Oh.

Ms. McLean: So by saying that a use would enhance the historical and cultural nature of the district, you said that it would and you approved it.

Chair Fredericksen: Cool.

Mr. Solamillo: Then no action?

Ms. Chandler: So does that mean that we have the ability to provide the comment now in this ...(inaudible)... along with this?

Chair Fredericksen: I think it might be cleaner to put that in there just so it's a category that's --

Ms. Thomson: If you want to.

Ms. Chandler: Oh great. Okay, I want to. So I would like to -- should we note the section number or something make it easier for them ...(inaudible)...

Ms. McLean: It's the very back page. The back page of that --

Mr. Solamillo: 19.52

Ms. McLean: The back page of the packet.

Mr. Solamillo: 6B, right?

Ms. Chandler: Uses that will enhance the historical and cultural nature -- okay, so where it says no. 2, "daycare centers, nurseries, preschools, kindergartens" -- oh no, no. 1, "museums, art galleries, book or gift stores." Do we create a new number?

Chair Fredericksen: It'd have to be a different number.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. So maybe 6, and then 6 becomes 7, or something like that?

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah. So after "residential planned development," then item 6 would be --

Ms. Chandler: Be "health and wellness establishments," or something like that. I don't wanna call them businesses, they might be non-profits, but health and wellness organizations, entities.

Chair Fredericksen: How about entities?

Ms. Chandler: Agencies?

Chair Fredericksen: No, not agencies.

Ms. Chandler: Entities.

Chair Fredericksen: Give us some good words, Corp. Counsel.

Ms. Thomson: I'm looking over the other historic district allowed uses and, let's see --

Mr. Solamillo: Physician's offices.

Ms. Thomson: Yeah, physician's offices, professional buildings. I don't know if you wanna -- that's fairly broad.

Mr. Hutaff: Well, other entities that would be beneficial to the community.

Chair Fredericksen: Health and wellness, it could be acupuncture or it could chiropractic, in this case.

Ms. Chandler: Oh, yeah, that's right. 'Cause it just says "daycare centers." It just says, "nurseries." So maybe we could say, "health and wellness." Just make a no. 6, "health and wellness."

Chair Fredericksen: Yeah, health and wellness.

Ms. Chandler: No descriptive adjective afterwards or something.

Ms. McLean: Yes.

Ms. Chandler: Okay. Wonderful.

Chair Fredericksen: Does that pass muster? Okay.

Ms. McLean: That does make it difficult for us when an applicant comes in, just hypothetically thinking of someone who you might not want to fall under that category, who would be saying I fall under this category.

Ms. Chandler: Oh.

Ms. McLean: I mean like a yoga -- a yoga studio or --

Chair Fredericksen: Which wouldn't necessarily be a bad thing.

Ms. McLean: Which -- but that would be saying, okay, that's health and wellness.

Chair Fredericksen: So what's a --

Mr. Solamillo: A kawa bar. I mean for some that's wellness and --

Ms. McLean: Or an oxygen bar.

Ms. Chandler: Okay. Is there a way we could put it that would make it not as difficult --

Chair Fredericksen: How about licensed health and wellness.

Ms. Chandler: That could get sketchy too. But if we -- I mean we want to not have what we had today, you know, so whatever we could do to allow for that kinda thing but still not make it complicated on the department.

Ms. Thomson: You can make it specific - physicians, acupuncturists, accountants. You know, if you list categories of professionals, then that might be easier for the department.



Ms. McLean: ...(inaudible)... more from the applicant's point of view because any of these proposed uses would have to come to you.

Chair Fredericksen: Right.

Ms. McLean: Okay, these are considered special uses so they'd have to come to you. It's just for an applicant approaching Stanley saying, oh, do I fall under a special use? He needs to be able to go, oh yeah, you know, you do versus no, a tattoo parlor is not health and wellness as far as the CRC is concerned.

Chair Fredericksen: Stanley --

Mr. Solamillo: See I'm slow. I need help.

Chair Fredericksen: Wording suggestions?

Mr. Solamillo: What an I suggesting? It didn't break. It worked today.

Ms. Sarich: Yeah.

Mr. Solamillo: So that's why I'm asking why do we need to fix it further? 'Cause we actually did what it said we were empowered to do. We determined that the proposed use was okay and it contributed to the district.

Ms. Chandler: So the only reason why it came up for discussion today was because of the way it was written on the agenda?

Mr. Solamillo: It's not part of the list. It's not --

Ms. McLean: That's true. That's what the concern was that it wasn't posted as approving a special use.

Ms. Chandler: Okay. Alright. Then I --

Mr. Solamillo: Because I didn't say 19.52.6B.

Chair Fredericksen: Okay. Okay, so we don't need to do this at this juncture. I did like it though.

Ms. Kanuha: Kawa bar. Tattoo parlor.

Mr. Solamillo: Can you imagine?

Ms. Kanuha: Oh my gosh.

Mr. Solamillo: And tell the pastor what we approved the use on his land.

Mr. Hutaff: In some parts of the world tattooing is considered healing.

## **2. March 1, 2012 CRC Meeting Agenda**

Mr. Solamillo: Yeah, I know that but -- okay, meeting agenda, March 1, 2012. It will be a hot one. You should have before you at that time Lana`i City Design Guidelines.

Chair Fredericksen: Will a representative of the landowner be available?

Mr. Solamillo: I have no idea. That's not my kuleana.

Mr. Hutaff: If I had to guess the answer, no.

Mr. Solamillo: This was going to be roast the chair day but since you got another month, we're going to save --

Chair Fredericksen: But our new Commission Member got a welcome lei.

Mr. Solamillo: That's right. This is very nice.

Ms. Chandler: For the agenda, is it possible to bring up an item now under the nomination, like we were saying to day that the Honolua Store is not nominated for any kind of registry and we wanted to, after that inspiring conference in Ka`anapali, start to do some work as a Commission on nominations in identifying properties, how could we maybe allocate some time for that in the future meetings, not necessarily this one, but --

Mr. Solamillo: You're going to have to do permission from a property owner on that case because I don't wanna pursue that. Go down that path again.

Ms. Chandler: Oh no, sure. It's not to nominate it specifically, but just the discussion of what might be nominate-able.

Mr. Solamillo: Right now, we have a backlog of multiple properties in Maui County that ae on the register, on the Hawai`i Register, and we haven't formally incorporated them into our code. So you could look -- we could actually go into some discussion, like all the Hana Bridges, right, were sitting out there somewhere and the Hana Bridge or the Hana Historical District is not in our code, so it's not listed like Historic District 1, 2, 3. So we've got all these multi-property districts that should somehow be codified and they haven't been

codified yet, and that's like a huge -- you know, so -- actually, that needs to be discussed with management, you know, what do we do? Do we finally begin this process of getting things --

Ms. Chandler: Yeah.

Mr. Solamillo: The other one, Fred Baldwin Memorial Home, we do at least one -- between one and two nominations every year, so Fred Baldwin Memorial Home, that's another multi-property district; Buddhist Temples of Maui County, that's one coming out this year. So there's all these things that are ongoing but they were stopping short of actually getting them codified.

Ms. Chandler: One of things they had said was the ability to create a local listing.

Mr. Solamillo: That's the one thing that I wanna be able to do because I think we're falling short. We came up with the same thing with the Moyer residence in Lahaina. It had been so altered, you know, that it didn't qualify based on integrity today, but they were -- the board of directors of that specific property said we want it on the register. I kinda looked at them and go, well, yeah, 20 years after you changed it, but I guess better late than never. So the thing is, how do you bring folks into the fold and then give them a program where they can go, you know, okay, you replace X, Y, and Z windows and, you know, then we get you on. That kinda thing.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. So just having that discussion maybe at a upcoming meeting about local listing and grant availability. They had also talked about the SHPD having a backlog of funding available to Certified Local Government that some of which is not applied for, and I had expressed the interest in writing a grant myself if that was allowable to try and write for that.

Mr. Solamillo: Do you have a project?

Ms. Chandler: You and I had brain-stormed on some things, but I think --

Mr. Solamillo: I don't remember. Why don't you send me an email if you have projects.

Ms. Chandler: Yeah. But maybe we could talk about what project ideas could come out of it at the next Commission meeting.

Chair Fredericksen: Excellent.

Mr. Solamillo: Okay, remember, Fredericksen roast next meeting.

Chair Fredericksen: I will remember the advance -- I was like, hey, I won't come next month? No, I wouldn't miss it, actually. I wanna make sure to be able to say goodbye to everybody.

Ms. Chandler: We'll find you.

Ms. Kanuha: Yeah. I think we know where you live.

Chair Fredericksen: Any other potential agenda items for next month that any Commission Member could think of? What's the Lana`i visitation, is that on this coming year's or this year's horizon or what's the funding like?

Mr. Solamillo: I wouldn't know. You'd have to ask our Deputy Director.

Mr. Hutaff: I'd like to know how that canoe club's faring with the permit process.

Mr. Solamillo: I don't know anything.

Mr. Hutaff: Where they stand.

Mr. Solamillo: Okay.

Chair Fredericksen: For Moloka`i?

Mr. Hutaff: Yeah, we were encouraging it moved quickly so I'm just kinda curious where it stands.

Chair Fredericksen: The Deputy Director can now comment.

Ms. McLean: Awe, he was trying to save me. No. We, you know, we try to pinch pennies wherever we can, but the Commission has a responsibility to go to Moloka`i and Lana`i at least annually. If there are no items to discuss, then, you know, we're not going to go. I think with Moloka`i we waiting too long and then once we decided we were going to go, you know, then there were attendance and quorum and the holidays and whatnot. But with Lana`i, at this point, we're under a deadline to give comments back to council on the Lana`i Design Review Guidelines, which is too bad, 'cause that would have been a good opportunity to go over there, but if there are other Lana`i items, then we'll go, certainly.

Mr. Solamillo: I wanted to thank everyone and thank Deputy Director McLean and Corporation Counsel Thomson.

Chair Fredericksen: Alright, everybody, well have a good month and see you next month.  
The meeting is adjourned.

**I. NEXT MEETING DATE: MARCH 1, 2012**

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business brought before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

SUZETTE L. ESMERALDA  
Secretary to Boards and Commissions

**RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

**Present**

Erik Fredericksen, Chairperson  
Raymond Hutaff, Vice-Chairperson  
Rhiannon Chandler  
Makalapua Kanuha  
Kahulu Maluo  
Warren Osako  
Brandis Sarich

**Excused**

Irene Ka`ahanui  
Bruce U`u

**Others**

Michele McLean, Deputy Planning Director  
Stanley Solamillo, Cultural Resources Planning  
Richelle Thomson, Deputy Corporation Counsel