

**CULTURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
DECEMBER 5, 2014**

\*\* 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, One Main Plaza, 2200 Main Street, Suite 315, Wailuku, Maui, Hawai'i. \*\*

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Cultural Resources Commission (Commission) was called to order by Chairperson Warren Osako, at approximately 10:34 a.m., Thursday, December 5, 2014, 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 Warren Osako: Okay, the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Maui County Cultural Resources Commission is now called to order.

**B. PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2014 MEETING**

Chair Osako: At this time, if there's anyone from the public that wishes to testify on any agenda item, and will not be here when that agenda item is up, may do so at this time. Just be aware that you may not be able to testify later when the agenda item comes up. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to testify at this time? If not, we'll move on to item C, Approval of the minutes of the October 2, 2014 meeting. Any comments or corrections?

Mr. Bruce U`u: Motion to approve.

Ms. Owana Salazar: Second.

Chair Osako: It has been and seconded that we approve the minutes of the October 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

***It has been moved by Commissioner U`u, seconded by Commissioner Salazar, the unanimously***

***VOTED: to approve the minutes of the October 2, 2014 meeting.***

Chair Osako: Motion is passed. Okay, moving on, item D, Public Hearing, action to be taken after public hearing.

*Chair Osako read the following agenda item into the record:*

**D. PUBLIC HEARING (Action to be taken after public hearing.)**

**Nomination of the Kahului Railroad Administration Building to the Hawaii and National Register of Historic Places, 101 East Ka'ahumanu Avenue, Kahului, Hawai'i 96732, TMK (2) 2-3-7-010:036. (A. Kehler)**

*At the closing of the public hearing, commissioners may determine if the property meets the criteria for nomination and make a recommendation that the State Historic Preservation Officer either nominate or reject the proposed nomination.*

Ms. Annalise Kehler: The owner of the property is the State Department of Transportation, and the consultant who prepared the National Register and Hawaii Register of Historic Places nomination is Don Hibbard, of Fung & Associates. Neither the applicant or consultant could be here today, however, I do have a presentation for you about the property, and I do have a letter from the State DOT in support of the nomination. So I'll begin with the presentation.

The building is located at 101 East Kaahumanu Avenue, in Kahului. There are three contributing resources on this property. The two L-shaped wings are the additions that were made in 1954, and the blue T-shaped building is the original administration building that was constructed in 1923 and it -- that's the one that faces Kaahumanu Avenue.

The property is eligible for listing in the registers under criterion A, which is a property that is associated with historic events, and it's eligible for A because it is associated with Kahului Railroad, and it's Hawaii's first and longest operating railroad. It is also eligible under National Register criterion C, and C is for properties that are designed by noted architects, or that possess distinctive characteristics of a type, and this particular building is a classical revival or neoclassical revival style. It was designed by a noted Maui architect, William D'Esmond, and also it is a really good example of this style applied to a private business.

So there are three significant dates associated with this property. In 1923, the original T-shaped administration building was constructed. In 1954, the two L-shaped free-standing additions were made, and that was significant because it allowed a railroad personnel and freight offices as well as a repair and maintenance manager to move into the administration building and they moved out of the coast guard building in the harbor. And then 1966 is the date that the last trail load of cane was hauled by the railroad company, and then also, that same year, Haleakala Storage and Transfer took over the company's hauling business and they laid off 15 employees.

This is a classical or neoclassical revival style building, and the elements that make it a neoclassical or classical revival are the pilasters, which are - you can kinda see the arrows pointing to the engaged -- their engaged square columns, and then there is a outset entry portico, which has been enclosed, but you can still see it, it's the -- and then entablature, which is the piece that sits above the pilasters, and the entablature consist of an architrave, a frieze, and a cornice. And then the building is constructed out of concrete. These are other examples of this type of architecture on Maui.

Mr. U`u: What the bottom right? Is that Lahaina?

Ms. Kehler: The bottom right is Kamehameha III Elementary School before they tore it down. Yeah. And the two top, the Lahaina Courthouse and Paia School, those were designed by the same architect.

Mr. U`u: ...(inaudible)... the one across Sears that demo'd ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Kehler: I don't know. I would have to look into that and get back to you. And then this is examples of this style applied to private businesses, both of these are in Lahaina, and both of them still exist although the one on the left, the Bank of Maui, it's been a little bit changed but you can still recognize those features. So this is the evolution of the building over time. You can see, in 1926, that's how it looks when it was first built; 1952, they had lots of creeping fig on it; the two original lamps are till intact on the front entry portico. Sometime in the 1970s, huh? 1970, they took the creeping fig off, it still looks the same, and then I'm not sure when, I think it was, you know, sometime in the '80s, they enclosed the front entrance, and they moved it to the east side, and even though it's enclosed, you can still recognize what that was at one time.

Ms. Salazar: Annalise, where are those lamps? Oh there. They're on the other entrance.

Ms. Kehler: Yeah.

Ms. Salazar: They moved the lamps?

Ms. Kehler: Uh-huh. So those original lamps have been moved to the west side of the building. And this is what it looks like today. I took these photographs the other day. And so this is the main building, the 1923, and then you can see, in the bottom right corner, that's part of the 1954 addition made out of CMU. And these are the 1954 additions, and they are connected to the main building through these covered walkways.

And for department recommendations, the department supports the nomination and it's finding that the building is eligible for nomination under criteria A and C. The department also recommends that the State Historic Preservation Officer nominate the proposed

nomination. And then, as a last recommendation, prior to forwarding the nomination to the National Park Service, the department recommends that there are a few minor issues that are addressed by the author before they send it off to the Park Service, and the department will forward a list of these issues to the author.

Chair Osako: Is there any discussion or questions, Commissioners?

Ms. Christy Kajiwara-Gusman: Have they stated what the building is going to be used for in the future? Is there any intent for this?

Ms. Kehler: Yeah, the Harbors Division will be renovating the interior so that they can move their -- the Kahului headquarters into that office.

Chair Osako: Go ahead, Frank.

Mr. Frank Skowronski: The recommendation is for all three buildings?

Ms. Kehler: Yes.

Mr. Skowronski: The main building and the two wings?

Ms. Kehler: The two wings are considered contributing resources, so they highlight a significant change in the railroad industry, so they are contributing resources.

Mr. Skowronski: So if we recommend this, it would be all three buildings and the connecting courtyard roof-ways?

Ms. Kehler: It's the property. You're nominating the property.

Mr. Skowronski: The entire property.

Ms. Kehler: Yeah.

Mr. Skowronski: In it's condition. Does the property include the two banyan trees?

Ms. Kehler: I don't know.

Mr. Skowronski: If the recommendation goes through, what kind of restrictions would be put on the property as far as renovations, paint, additions, subtractions?

Ms. Kehler: The only restrictions are Chapter 6E of the Hawaii Revised Statutes, and it now applies to all buildings that are 50 years and older, and there is a specific part of the

Chapter 6E that relates to buildings listed on the Hawaii and National Register, but other than that, it doesn't really specify anymore restrictions in any other building over 50 years old.

Ms. Bridget Mowat: What I think, it's not going to be changed to modernize it or anything, it's going to be sticking like that statutes is protecting and saying that they have to stick to the design and the materials and so forth.

Ms. Kehler: It's recommended, but it's not a requirement.

Mr. Skowronski: So -- I mean there appears to be some structural damage on the two wings.

Ms. Kehler: Right.

Mr. Skowronski: There's large cracks in the CMU, and there's deterioration on the fascia, and a couple of other things. If the DOT were to go back in and fix those in the course of their rehabilitation and upgrading of the building, would they have to replace all the construction and all the building materials in-kind, exactly as it is right now?

Ms. Kehler: They don't have to, but it's recommended. And I would also like to note that they've already gone through the design review process with the State Historic Preservation Division, and their plans were submitted to them a while ago and they've been approved.

Mr. Skowronski: So the renovations that they're anticipating have already gone through the State Historic Preservation --

Ms. Kehler: They meet the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Mr. Skowronski: And been approved?

Ms. Kehler: Yes.

Mr. U`u: Question. Just similar to the renovation project they doing next door on the roof where they use similar material that kinda looks like it. If I not mistaken, it's similar in -- similar and viewed as, you know, acceptable. And if I not mistaken, will they have to come back to CRC to show -- do we comment on the renovations or not?

Ms. Kehler: No.

Mr. U`u: Or is it Urban Design Review or there's somebody else that would review?

Ms. Kehler: They're exempt from a lot of processes because they're a state building.

Mr. U`u: Okay. Okay.

Ms. Kehler: But they're not exempt from 6E review with the State Historic Preservation Division, and they already went through that, and all of their design meets the standards.

Mr. U`u: Okay. Okay. So I just wanted to throw the comment, if possible, I would like to see, potentially, if we could restore that front entry to its original state, including, you know, taking down that two walls that they made so we can have the architect in its original intent to use, and also by taking the two lights that were placed on the side and put them back in the front. I'd like to put that as a comment. I know we have the nomination -- nominate or reject the proposed nomination, but I would like to do so that in a form of a comment, if possible. Do you think that would be acceptable, Annalise, or just something to digest, or if anybody had any comments?

Ms. Kehler: It was something that was thrown around during their design process, but because of the way that the internal office organization will work, they couldn't accommodate that part into their plans.

Mr. U`u: I still would like to add that along with one, for myself, I see no problem with the project and pushing it forward, but I guess we can base that on a form of my comments.

Ms. Kehler: Okay.

Mr. U`u: 'Cause it has to shoot them back up to Planning and then to the Mayor, just for my benefit.

Chair Osako: Frank.

Mr. Skowronski: Just from a *Robert's Rules of Order*, do we need all five votes?

Chair Osako: Well, there's six of us.

Mr. Skowronski: There's six so --

Chair Osako: Yeah. If you all five vote one way, it doesn't matter. If four of you vote one way, it depends on how I vote.

Mr. Skowronski: Then you come in?

Chair Osako: Yeah.

Mr. Skowronski: Okay.

Chair Osako: Then I come in.

Mr. Skowronski: Okay.

Chair Osako: But if you're less than that, like say three-two, there's not going to be a decision.

Mr. Skowronski: Well, my comment, more than anything else, is I'm understanding that the designation is on the property, and not on the buildings. Is that accurate?

Ms. Kehler: You're nominating the three -- the buildings. Yes. The buildings to the National Register of Historic Places, so the main building is 1923, and then the two, there's two contributing resources on the property, the other two buildings.

Mr. Skowronski: This is where -- this is where I have a problem because those two wings do nothing for the original building. Those two wings don't have any construction cooperation or reflection on the original building. It's concrete block. It's failing. It's -- there's no way for us or is there any way for us to comment that we're strongly in favor of leaving the original T-shaped building that goes back to the '20s, and do everything we possibly can to either restore, enhance, or do anything with those buildings, but the other two wings are -- they're not up to any kind of historical standard that is complimentary to the original building so that, you know, I would support restrictions on renovations to the main building, but if they wanted to tear those two rear buildings down or put a second story on them or even refurbish them so that they have the same look or the same materials as the main building, I would support that. But I'm hesitant to -- I'm hesitant to include the other two buildings and, particularly, those walkway canopies that don't do anything for either of the -- any of the three buildings. I also would love to somehow make a comment that the buildings presence is enhanced by keeping and maintaining aggressively the two banyan trees that flank it. Now, I don't know if they're on the property or not, but if they are on the property and what you're saying is the historic status is on the property and not on the buildings, then I strongly suggest that we add something to mention that both flanking banyan trees are now part of that historic process.

Ms. Kehler: Okay, first most important point is that being on the National and State Historic Registers does not mean any property restrictions. There are none. It is an honorary thing. It does not mean that you cannot do anything to it. It just means that whatever, any other building in the state that's over 50 years old has to go through the same review process. And the other point is that what we're doing today is we are recommending whether or not you find these building eligible for listing, and then you're recommending to the State Historic Preservation Officer whether they nominate the proposed nomination

or they reject it. So if you would like to say that you do not think that other two buildings are contributing resources, then you can put that recommendation in that the nomination is altered to say that there's one contributing resource and two non-contributing resources, if that is what you feel.

Mr. Skowronski: What about the trees?

Ms. Kehler: Trees are not part of the National Register of Historic Places, but they can be part of the scenery.

Mr. Skowronski: Well, I would propose to the board that we at least consider the possibility that the two wings are non-contributing.

Ms. Salazar: Thank you. With regard to the building B and building C, you know, I'm really glad that we went to this workshop in the last couple of days because we did learn that additions to the original structure need not be exactly the same; in fact, it's stipulated that connections to an existing historical structure should be -- should show that there's a difference in the time. And the other thing is that the -- let's see, the second addition was it the year 1954? So it shows that it is 60 years old as of this year, so 50 years is one of the criteria, so even though it's not, the 1954 buildings are not exactly like the building in 1923, it actually still does qualify in the historic criteria, and so I'm okay with that. I also would like to comment that I agree with our Vice-Chair, Bruce, with regard to it would be wonderful to have that front entrance in its grand state again as it was originally. And from the look of this plan, which I guess these numbers are kind of off because no. 17 and no. 1 are somewhere else off the page, off of the drawing, but they are actually making significant changes within the building, taking down certain -- like no. 1, remove all existing interior partition walls; no. 2, remove existing wall paper, well, that's okay, and removing interior doors, number -- they're doing a lot of things inside, which is okay, that's what we learned also, which is acceptable as for the changes as long as the exterior of the building does not change. So but I think if there's any way we can fortified what you've said, you know, Bruce, that the entrance be returned to that, and bring those lamp posts in the center because that's what you will see. It is the curb appeal, what we call in real estate, the curb appeal, and then that would just be perfect, you know, to have that back, yes, bring it back to its original grandeur, they say. So that's my comments. Thank you.

Ms. Richelle Thomson: You might want to take a look at the -- page 4, of you staff report. because it might help you kind of form your own recommendations, so one of the recommendations by staff is the application consider all three buildings, the administration building, which is the one that's in the application currently, but adding those two wings, so, you know, that was something that you can consider, you know, adopting the department's recommendation or not adopting it, you know, this is your recommendation to the review



process. I just wanted to kind of point that out so that you can take a look at the department's recommendations to consider.

Ms. Mowat: I just -- the building, the first building was built in 1923, and then within 31 years, in 1954, those other buildings. I think that's part of the history of how the railroad expanded and needed to accommodate so, to me, that's all historic stuff. And the roof is corrugated iron?

Ms. Kehler: Correct.

Ms. Mowat: And these, you know, it seems like they were trying to keep in -- 'cause that walkways looks like corrugated iron, but the line seem to kind of fit. So as far as history, that part is very important, to me, but whatever, you know, I agree that all three buildings. And the recommendations you have stated, I also agree with the recommendations, so maybe the recommendations that you folks are talking about.

Ms. Salazar: ...(inaudible)... the front entrance.

Ms. Mowat: Thank you.

Ms. Kehler: May I just clarify something? So let me give you an example of a property that has multiple buildings on it that's on the National Register of Historic Places. Ma`alaea General Store is a property that has three buildings on it, okay, and the nomination is for the main building, it's for the general store, but there are two outbuildings that are on the property that you must account for in your National Register Nomination. Now those two are not contributing resources because they were -- one was built and it's not older than 50 years old, and the other one is a reconstruction, and reconstructions do not qualify as being eligible. In the case of the two additions, we aren't nominating the building -- those two buildings based on their own merit; they're contributing resources. And although they have been altered over time to meet changing needs, they are still recognizable as the modern style that they were made in, and page 2, of the staff report, list the main features that make those building -- those buildings were constructed with that make them unique, it's the inset six-foot wide concrete lanai that wrap around the courtyard facades, and the walls fronting the lanais primarily consist of windows and doors, a number of the windows and doors on both the courtyard facades and the exterior facades have been reconfigured but the same general fenestration pattern remains the same. In addition to that, the low pitched hip roofs remain the same, and the corrugated metal roof remains the same, so it is still recognizable as a 1954 addition.

Mr. U`u: Just a comment. And I kinda agree with Frank on the architectural standpoint of the building and -- but the 1954 addition has a story on its own, and the addition to the administration building allowed the railroad company to move its personnel and freight

offices as well as it repair and maintenance manager into the administration building, so even with the building, it shows the progress of the railroad becoming bigger, therefore, the need for an administration office that moved that main office from the coast guard building in that area to move the administration building in the back, so on top of -- granted, I don't think it has the architectural appeasement for what I like to see, but it definitely has a story on its own to coincide with the existing buildings, so that's my mana`o.

Chair Osako: Anybody else?

Ms. Salazar: I have just a question, if you don't mind. What are the few minor issues that are being forwarded to the author? I'm just curious.

Ms. Kehler: On page 4, of the staff report, there's a list of like small errors and things like that.

Ms. Salazar: Oh here. I see it. Thank you.

Chair Osako: Anything else? At this time, is there anyone in the audience that wishes to testify on this agenda item?

Ms. Kehler: Okay. No.

Chair Osako: No.

Ms. Kehler: Okay, so, Warren, you closed the public hearing now, right?

Ms. Thomson: Yeah, I guess, exactly at the end of testimony, then the public hearing part's closed.

Chair U`u: Okay, we'll wait till Bruce gets here.

Ms. Mowat: May I just say something? Annalise, thank you for the staff report. I really enjoyed it, and I thought it was very educational.

Ms. Kehler: Thank you.

Ms. Salazar: Yes, thank you. Thank you very much.

Chair Osaka: Okay, let's be back in session and I just have a comment also. While the original entry was covered up and for purposes of the interior, I still think that the appearance of it, being the way it was, can still be made and still maintain the interior, it doesn't have to be and operating entrance, but just made to look the way it was so, you

know, in the sense I would support that, not that it would be an entrance, but it would have the appearance of the original building.

Ms. Kehler: Okay. And then another thing, a suggestion I can make regarding the trees, is that, you know, as part of your recommendations, you can ask that the National Register nomination explore the history of those trees if you're interested in them, you know, that can be part of the historic context and it might be part of the historic significance of the building, and it might not, it might predate the building, so that could be a recommendation that the author do a little background into that.

Mr. Skowronski: Well, it would be helpful also to find out if the trees are actually on the TMK and the property that we're considering. Maybe it's a moot issue. The trees may not be older than the original building, but they're certainly older than the additions.

Mr. U`u: I'd like to -- can I make a motion?

Chair Osako: Sure.

Mr. U`u: I'd like to make a motion to nominate this project and move it up the ladder, as stated in here, with the addition of the comments we said previously.

Chair Osako: I think we make a recommendation for or against the nomination.

Mr. U`u: Okay. Okay. I'd like to recommend -- I'd like to nominate the --

Chair Osako: Oh no, yeah.

Mr. U`u: We're nominating, right?

Chair Osako: No. We're making a recommendation on the nomination.

Mr. U`u: I would like to recommend nomination from the CRC, recommend thumbs up, as stated in the comments, in the recommendations.

Ms. Salazar: I second.

Chair Osako: Okay, it has been moved and seconded that we recommend approval of the nomination with the comments of the Commission. All those in favor? Anymore discussion?

Mr. U`u: So that would include the comments that we mentioned earlier?

Ms. Salazar: Yes ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Kehler: Can you restate those for clarification? I just want to make sure that -- because there was a couple of comments made.

Mr. U`u: One of the comments would be to bring that original entry area into its original state, removal of that front entrance, and potentially putting back the lamps in its original state too, and finding out about the trees, if we can preserve the trees. Anything else?

Ms. Kajiwara-Gusman: Just a comment, if I may. The sugar plantation or the railroad industry was brought about by the sugar industry and in here it also states, you know, when it became a part of HC&S and A&B. And just food for thought, you know, I think we all need to remember that this is an important project, not only because of its age, but because we do still have a sugar industry here on Maui and we're the only island that does, so that's, you know, my reason for supporting it is it's a significance that we still have this industry here today.

Chair Osako: Okay, so are we -- is that sufficient, Annalise?

Ms. Kehler: Yeah.

Chair Osako: Okay, so it has been moved and seconded that we recommend approval of the nomination with the comments of the Commission.

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

***It has been moved by Commissioner U`u, seconded by Commissioner Salazar, then unanimously***

***VOTED: to recommend approval of the nomination with the comments of the Commission.***

Chair Osako: It has been voted to recommend approval. I guess now it's item E, Director's Report.

## **E. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

- 1. Report on the Commission Assistance & Mentoring Program training, December 3 – 4, 2014 in Kona, Hawai'i Island. This training was funded by the Hawai'i State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) using Certified Local Government (CLG) grant money. SHPD awarded**

**scholarships for the attendance of three Maui County Cultural Resources Commission members.**

Ms. Kehler: So, on December 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>, myself, Commissioner U`u, Bridget, and Owana, we went to Kona for some commissioner training, and it was called "The CAMP training," and CAMP stands for Commission Assistance & Mentoring Program. This was funded through a Certified Local Government grant, and it was hosted by the National Alliance for Preservation Commissions, and we learned a lot of stuff, and some of the more pertinent things that we discussed were learning about what a CLG is; what your duties are as a CLG; we learned about some legal basics about our local ordinances, and federal and state laws. One really good topic was meeting procedures, doing what's applicable, and best practices for public hearings, and public meetings. We learned about surveying and inventory, that means identifying important historic resources, and then designating them at the local level. And then, yesterday, we learned about standards and guidelines for design review, and that means, you know, applying the Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation to the work that we do and design review, and then we had a fun exercise yesterday where we did a mock preservation hearing, and we had some bad behavior from commissioners, staff, attorneys, and applicants, and we learned about why that behavior is not good, and we learned about what we can do to make it better, make clearer for the record. And then we learned a little bit about preservation planning, and making a preservation plan, and how you can do that at really small level, and just that small little plan can really help a neighborhood define their preservation goals. And, you know, when -- at our next meeting, I will go over a lot of this stuff, and I will do a new commissioner orientation, and we will talk about the sections of our county code that are applicable to what you folks do, and we'll talk about some rules, and just, you know, we'll get right into everything that we learned at this CAMP, and then if anyone attended wants to say anything or share anything that you really liked, I'm sure your fellow commissioners would like to hear.

Ms. Salazar: Okay, well, one of the things we do also yesterday was really look at a -- plot out some kind of an agenda or plan of where we want to go, and what I really appreciated, one of the many things I really appreciated about this CAMP was that -- was the -- that we can be proactive and not just receive what is coming and then say okay or not okay, but we go out and I always knew that could be done but it's how, how it can be done, and so we -- we drew out, we had not enough time we felt because the day was drawing to a close, to look at a one-year and a three-year and five-year projection as to those objectives and goals of what we'd like to do as a Commission in recommending historical sites and places and even towns, additional towns, in Maui County, and I found that particularly inspiring and motivating to move forward with, so however we can put things like that on our agenda, I am all for it and all over it. Yeah.

Ms. Mowat: Very education, and then it was a networking also with other commissioners, planners from different islands. But the one thing I liked the best that they provided was this.

Ms. Salazar: Yeah. The USB.

Ms. Mowat: The whole powerpoint in here. So you know how when you got two days and a lot of information, it goes by fast, and you really can't absorb, so this, to me, was a tool that I can go home and view and really, you know, so we each got one and there's just -- there wasn't -- at the evaluation, they asked which part was most valued, you know, there was -- everything was valuable, very good, and I would recommend that any new commissioner or, yeah, would attend something like this, and I really think that more of these types of training would be available. So it was a well planned, well thought out session that I really enjoyed.

Ms. Salazar: In fact, we also talked about getting a trainer to come here, and go into executive session, and receive some more training. I mean this was so much. It was really exciting. And when they said what was the things you liked the least, I just wrote, "Well, the fattening cookies," you know, because there wasn't anything we liked least. They had incentives. It was so funny when you given them -- they were fun, the trainers, as well as, you know, intellectually stimulating and inspiring. They threw out candy if you gave a right answer. So it was fun.

Mr. U`u: I'd just like to add that I too enjoyed it and I think everyone should be a part of it. It gave you a plan of attack to how to go about doing something and to the point where we mocked some roles where you could actually react -- reenact or pursue and have an action step plan to obtain what you wanted to accomplish. More importantly, I think the resources out there for the funding was available within that room and that's a process that we'll be, you know, going through looking for, funding and how fragile and how time sensitive it is and but I think it's a worth cause, and like today's meeting with the railroad, that's an important structure that has a lot of history. It showed how objects, places, sites, you can keep a part of history, and the goal was if you could take your grandmother, walk down the street, and she could explain the history by visually looking at the building, you would achieve what was meant to be, and I think that railroad, if we do it that way, I think if we kicked that door out, and we put that how it was, the place in the front, and you walk the kupuna through, I think they can remember how it was back then, then that's when we know we succeeded. So it was pretty interesting to me. I look forward to getting more of these on line, definitely, because Hawaii's history is very rich.

Ms. Salazar: I have a question. Before our next meeting, do we need to propose to have an executive session or is it something we can decide that day?

Ms. Thomson: It wouldn't actually be an executive session. That's just for confidential matters. It usually has to do with your, you know, legal rights and duties kind of thing and the ramifications of decisions. But it would just be a regular training. When I was listening to you, I was thinking that it might be good to have an agenda item and just discussing priority projects for the CRC for the upcoming year or something, you know, and then you can kinda toss all the ideas out on the table and get everybody's feedback. Maybe, you know, if you need to appoint investigative groups, you know, as long as it's less than quorum, then you can do work outside of the normal meeting setting, and we can discuss how you do it, so like the sign design guidelines, just as an example, but some of these projects might lend themselves to be handled that way.

Ms. Salazar: Thank you.

Mr. U`u: By the way, Annalise did an awesome job there.

Ms. Salazar: Yes. She did.

Ms. Mowat: She was the star pupil.

Ms. Salazar: Oh yeah.

Mr. U`u: We no care if she's 19.

Ms. Salazar: And we want to go to Mobile, Alabama, in 2016. So now we understand how to get some funds for that too. Annalise has to push that pen, hit those keys.

Ms. Kehler: CLG funding does send commissioners to the -- so we had a small CAMP, but there's a big CAMP that's on the Mainland, and it's every two years, and there is funding available for those types of training as well, so you can go travel to the Mainland and learn too.

Chair Osako: So, along those lines, I also discussed a little bit, before everybody got here, with Annalise about I went to dinner last night at Hotel Lanai, I don't know if some of you are familiar with Hotel Lanai, it was built at the start of the pineapple plantation because when people from Honolulu, you know, the big city, the government came over, they needed a place to house them, and last night I noticed on the wall a plaque from the National --

Ms. Kehler: The National Trust for Historic --

Chair Osako: Yeah, National Trust for Historic Preservation gave them a plaque for that historic building, and then so with -- under the new ownership, I think it's possible that we can get some nominations ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Salazar: Great. Excellent.

Chair Osako: Because the previous ownership was totally against the nomination because everything was money and they wanted to do what they wanted to do, and so I think I'm going to start, although my term is ending, I'm going to start trying initiating some of these.

Ms. Salazar: Definitely. Carry it on. How much longer in your term?

Chair Osako: March, so Bruce and I, March will be our last meeting.

Ms. Salazar: You too?

Chair Osako: Yeah, you too.

Ms. Salazar: Oh my gosh.

Mr. U`u: It's pau.

Chair Osako: Okay.

## **2. Discussion on scheduling a public hearing for the adoption of the Lāhainā Sign Design Guidelines updates.**

Ms. Kehler: No. 2, under Director's Report, it's a discussion on scheduling a public hearing for the adoption of the Lahaina Sign Design Guidelines updates. Our regularly scheduled meeting is for January 2<sup>nd</sup>, but that not only will it not be enough time to post a public hearing notice in the newspaper, you need 30 days, but I don't think -- I'm not sure if the Commission will be available to meet on the 2<sup>nd</sup>, so if there's a date that works better for you towards the middle or end of January, let's discuss it now.

Ms. Kajiwara-Gusman: I was going to ask about that because that's also the inauguration for the new council, well, the county council and the mayor too.

Ms. Kehler: In January?

Ms. Kajiwara-Gusman: That January 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Ms. Kehler: Oh, okay. If January doesn't work, then maybe February.



Ms. Salazar: I'm not in favor of not having a meeting for another month.

Ms. Kehler: Okay.

Ms. Salazar: We've had so many cancellations and for lack of quorum or agenda, and I definitely would like to propose that we go ahead and meet the following Thursday, the 8<sup>th</sup> of January.

Ms. Kehler: Does that meet 30 days.

Ms. Salazar: Do we need a motion for that? Okay, I move that our January meeting will be scheduled for January 8<sup>th</sup>, at the usual time, Thursday, January 8, 2015.

Ms. Kajiwara-Gusman: Second.

Chair Osako: Okay, it's been moved and seconded that we reschedule the January 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting for the following Thursday, which would make it January 8<sup>th</sup>.

***It has been moved by Commissioner Salazar, seconded by Commission Kajiwara-Gusman, then unanimously***

***VOTED: to reschedule the January 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting to Thursday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2015.***

Chair Osako: Motion carries.

Mr. Skowronski: Does the Planning Department have a perspective agenda for that January meeting?

Ms. Kehler: One more thing. There was some discussion about whether or not we wanted to have the public hearing for the Lahaina Sign Design Guidelines in Lahaina.

Ms. Salazar: Oh.

Chair Osako: I think that would be a good idea.

Ms. Salazar: Yeah, I do too.

Chair Osako: You know, because people in Lahaina then can attend without making the trip over.

Ms. Salazar: Okay, shall I make another motion then?

Mr. U`u: No. No need a motion.

Ms. Thomson: I don't think you have to do this by motion.

Ms. Salazar: No need make one motion for the location? Okay. Thank you. So we can do the same time and everything. So where would the location probably be?

Chair Osako: The county building is --

Ms. Thomson: Yeah, there's a senior center out there that's a good venue but Annalise will have to check and see on the availability.

Ms. Salazar: Okay. I'll just say Lahaina on my schedule. Okay. Excellent idea.

Chair Osako: Okay, so then we would -- we were talking about having that on January 8<sup>th</sup> or at a later date?

Ms. Kehler: That's up to you folks.

Mr. U`u: Okay, let's schedule the meeting in Lahaina.

Ms. Kehler: In Lahaina? Okay, and would you like to have it on the 8<sup>th</sup> or would you like to have it at a --

Mr. U`u: We can have it on the 8<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Thomson: I think that's --

Ms. Kajiwarra-Gusman: That's too soon. You need the 30 days.

Ms. Thomson: That's too soon.

Chair Osako: But, well, it might be too early for that -- the notice for the public hearing. Well, I don't know about the 8<sup>th</sup>, but the 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Ms. Salazar: Oh, but it doesn't fall into -- okay, well --

Ms. Kehler: There's not enough time between now and the 8<sup>th</sup> to do a public hearing.

Ms. Salazar: And there's the 15<sup>th</sup> or any other --

Ms. Kajiwara-Gusman: Put them on the February -- put the Lahaina thing on the February calendar and do that meeting in Lahaina.

Ms. Thomson: It might be good for the staff to have time to check to see when the venues are open and then they can just poll all of you and make sure you're available and that kind of thing instead of trying to lock it down too much.

Mr. U`u: Yeah. I agree. That's a good idea.

Ms. Kehler: Okay, so we have consensus.

Chair Osako: Yeah, we'll schedule it for -- try to schedule when we have the venue and all of that ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Salazar: Okay, so as it is now, are we having a meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup>, somewhere, here? Here? And the Lahaina one will be scheduled in Lahaina --

Chair Osako: For whenever they can get the venue and ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Salazar: Okay. Excellent. Alright.

Mr. Skowronski: The meeting that we're going to have for the public hearing, that's going to be the only thing on our agenda, right?

Chair Osako: No, not necessarily.

Mr. Skowronski: Well, should we make a recommendation that --

Chair Osako: Oh, because there might be a lot of testimony.

Mr. Skowronski: Well, if there's other agenda items, then that means people from here have to go out there.

Chair Osako: Oh yeah. Yeah.

Mr. Skowronski: If we could somehow just restrict it. My suspicion is that it's going to dominate our meeting, and it'll be nice to have the whole meeting just dedicated to the sign review.

Ms. Kehler: May I make a suggestion for date?

Mr. U`u: No. Kidding ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Kehler: I suggest that we go ahead and take the regularly scheduled February meeting date, which is the 5<sup>th</sup>, and we schedule our public hearing for the 5<sup>th</sup> in Lahaina. That gives us a better chance of finding a venue and getting ready for the public hearing, posting notice and everything.

Mr. Skowronski: Can we restrict the agenda to just the signage draft -- signage ordinance? Is there something coming down the pike on your agenda that's critical that has to be included?

Ms. Kehler: No. No. We can --

Mr. U`u: I mean signage -- I mean approval of minutes, you know --

Ms. Kehler: Yeah, regular business.

Mr. U`u: Regular business. Right. Okay.

Ms. Kehler: Oh, one more thing, time? Do we want to do it at 10:30 or -- the regular time?

Mr. U`u: Yeah.

Ms. Kehler: 10:30?

Chair Osako: For me, it doesn't matter because --

Mr. U`u: You can go 10 now for him.

Chair Osako: Yeah, you could go earlier if you want.

Mr. Skowronski: We should do it earlier because it's going to take time.

Mr. U`u: Yeah. I agree.

Ms. Mowat: There's going to be some that are going to say I had to work.

Ms. Kajiwara-Gusman: They can submit written testimony.

Ms. Mowat: Yeah. That's true. So 10:30 throughout the day 'cause there's going to be plenty people I'm sure. So those that are not able to come in the earlier part, they can probably come in later. Okay.

Ms. Salazar: So this is going to be notice sent to all the shopkeepers or ...(inaudible)...

Chair Osaka: The regular meeting was moved to 10:30 because for me was pretty shaky about getting here in time, but Lahaina, I don't have to make the drive.

Ms. Salazar: Oh, right. Okay. Now, it's my understanding that --

Chair Osaka: Yeah, but then they have to pay for a hotel.

Ms. Salazar: So the notice that goes to the public is newspaper only? What is the notice? How is the public notice given?

Ms. Kehler: In the newspaper, and the agenda. Same --

Ms. Salazar: The *Lahaina News*?

Ms. Kehler: We can do that too. We can do a press release.

Ms. Salazar: Yeah, because if it's going to be in Lahaina, and it's about Lahaina, I'd like to suggest that it be in the *Lahaina News* especially, and perhaps because this is going to be signage and -- is there going to be like anything posted where people can see it? Like what about the shopkeepers? They're the ones that --

Ms. Kajiwarra-Gusman: I think that community association, the one that ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Kehler: Yeah, I can let Lahaina Restoration and the merchants out there, let them know.

Ms. Salazar: Is there a merchants organization?

Ms. Kehler: Lahaina Town Action Committee is kind of like the merchants --

Ms. Salazar: In addition to the newspaper, make sure -- we gotta catch them, you know, nobody's going to say, oh, I didn't know, you know, 'cause they don't read the paper and all these people are on the internet and -- but yeah. Thank you.

Ms. Thomson: Can I just make a quick comment? I wasn't here at the last meeting but I think that you did consider the current draft of the design guidelines, sign design guidelines, so what I wanted to make sure of is that you folks feel that you're at the stage where you're ready for the public hearing. So are those guidelines pretty well what you would like to see? Because you don't want to take something that's premature out for public hearing. You might want to have further, you know, regular meeting agenda item hearing. Do you know what I'm saying?

Mr. U`u: Yes.

Ms. Thomson: Okay.

Ms. Salazar: Well, you know that they're going to be -- yeah, we were prepared for that.

Ms. Mowat: If I'm not mistaken that we went through each --

Ms. Kajiwarra-Gusman: Section.

Ms. Mowat: Section and made comments and recommendations.

Ms. Salazar: And the public will have theirs, so we're still not finished.

Mr. Skowronski: We're not finished.

Ms. Salazar: So we're in the forward motion and I'm all for going forward.

Ms. Mowat: Yes.

Ms. Thomson: At the end of your public hearing, you know, probably what you're -- what you're really looking to do at the end of this public hearing is probably go ahead and adopt those sign design guidelines, so what I was suggesting is that if there -- it sounds like you've already gone through it very carefully though, so you're probably at the stage where you do want to take it out for, you know, the public's last comments, but you don't really want to make major changes to it at that stage.

Ms. Salazar: Yeah.

Ms. Thomson: You know. 'Cause then you would have to re-notice, re-publish it; it's expensive.

Mr. Skowronski: Is it going to be required that we vote on the ordinance after the public hearing at that meeting? Can we defer that vote to take in the comments from the public so that we don't have to vote until maybe the March meeting?

Ms. Thomson: Right. So you can -- you can hold the public hearing, have public testimony, so what you do is, you know, finish off that part of it, which includes the public's participation, and defer your decision-making if you're not able to get to a -- if you're not able to get to a decision at that time, you could defer it to the next meeting.

Mr. U`u: Question, Chair. Maybe for the January 8 meeting, we can go over review of the sign guidelines just to - just to, you know, cross the t's and dot the i's, if possible, Annalise.

Ms. Thomson: Just to throw a wrench in it, then you'd wanna move your public hearing to March because you have to publish and you have to have the actual document ready for public viewing 30 days ahead.

Mr. U`u: Or maybe not.

Ms. Salazar: If that's the case, we just wanna keep moving ahead. This has been going on all year so ...(inaudible)...

Chair Osako: Yeah, so what do you think, Annalise, March or -- if we're going to do another review?

Mr. U`u: I'll go for February.

Ms. Salazar: February. Yeah, me too.

Ms. Kehler: So you folks wanna move forward with the February 15 public hearing date, that's the one that you will be adopting the guidelines. Correct?

### **3. Approval of the proposed meeting schedule for Calendar Year 2015**

*The Commission may act to approve the proposed meeting schedule with amendments.*

Chair Osako: Okay, otherwise, are there anymore comments about the schedule for 2015?

Mr. U`u: Just one change, correct?

Chair Osako: Well, the one change was the January 8<sup>th</sup>, instead of 2<sup>nd</sup>, but any other comments or anything about the schedule?

Ms. Salazar: Wait, wait, wait. You just said "February 15<sup>th</sup>." You meant February 5<sup>th</sup>, right?

Ms. Kehler: Oh, sorry.

Ms. Salazar: Okay ...(inaudible)... flag went up. Okay, thank you.

Chair Osako: Okay?

Ms. Salazar: Alright.

Ms. Kehler: Wait, just some clarification. So are we having a meeting in January or no?

Ms. Salazar: Yes, on the 8<sup>th</sup> here.

Ms. Kehler: Okay. Okay.

Mr. Skowronski: If you have items.

Ms. Kehler: Yeah, what I'll do on January 8<sup>th</sup> is your training.

Ms. Salazar: We have an item. It's our training, yeah. Whether there's a public thing or not.

Ms. Esmeralda: This room is not available on January 8<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Salazar: On the 8<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Kehler: Is there another date where this room is available?

Chair Osako: Okay, so shall we formally approve the schedule with the changes?

Mr. U`u: We're waiting. The 8<sup>th</sup> is ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Salazar: We're waiting -- the room.

Chair Osako: Oh. Oh, the 8<sup>th</sup> is not going to work. Okay.

Ms. Salazar: Or 7<sup>th</sup> or somewhere. We want the meeting in January for sure. Yeah, it doesn't have to be Thursday.

Ms. Mowat: Can we do it on a Friday?

Ms. Salazar: Yeah, she's going to check when the room's available. The 7<sup>th</sup> is okay?  
Same time?

Chair Osako: So that's a Wednesday, right?

Ms. Salazar: It's a Wednesday.



Chair Osako: Oh no. Yeah, yeah, Wednesday.

Ms. Mowat: Just one day less to prepare.

Ms. Salazar: Oh dear.

Mr. U`u: It's just a training so you're prepared.

Chair Osako: Okay, shall we approve the revised schedule.

Mr. U`u: Motion to approve.

Ms. Mowat: Second.

***It has been moved by Commissioner U`u, seconded by Commissioner Mowat, then unanimously***

***VOTED: to approve the revised 2015 meeting schedule.***

Chair Osako: Okay, approved.

**F. NEXT MEETING DATE: Friday, January 2, 2015**

**G. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Osako: Okay, so on the item F, next meeting date is January 7, that's a Wednesday.

Ms. Salazar: 10:30 in this room.

Chair Osako: Okay, unless anybody has anything else, that's it. Anybody, have anything else? Okay, meeting adjourned.

There being no further business brought before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 11:38 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

SUZETTE L. ESMERALDA  
Secretary to Boards & Commissions

**RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

**Present**

Warren Osako, Chairperson  
Bruce U`u, Vice-Chairperson  
Christy Kajiwara-Gusman  
Bridget Mowat  
Owana Salazar  
Frank Skowronski

**Excused**

Arlene Ricalde-Garcia  
Janet Six

**Others**

Annalise Kehler, Cultural Resources Planner  
Richelle Thomson, Deputy Corporation Counsel