

**CULTURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
SEPTEMBER 5, 2003**

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Cultural Resources Commission (Commission) was called to order by Chair Dawn Duensing at 1:40 p.m., Friday, September 5, 2003, Lana`i Library, Lana`i City, Island of Lana`i.

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

B. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION WITH TONIA MOY, STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE RELATING TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR GUIDELINES

Ms. Duensing: The first item on our agenda today is a presentation and discussion with Tonia Moy who is from the State Historic Preservation Division. And for some time now I've been interested in having Tonia speak to our Commission regarding the Secretary of the Interior Standards, which are the regulations and guidelines that the CRC as a certified local government agency should be following. So that's what I'd really like to concentrate on today. And keeping in mind that we're supposed to follow guidelines; not just do what we think we'd like to see. The Federal government has established all these guidelines, and just to try to make ourselves with them, and realize that that's the operating procedures that we should be going by. So we've all met Tonia, and I'm going to just let her go on from here then.

Ms. Tonia Moy: Just to get our terminology a little straight, we're going to talk about rehabilitation. There's different ways to treat a building besides rehabilitation. One is to restore it, which usually involves like taking a time period, but this requires really good knowledge of what the building looked like. So when people say restore, I mean, most people use it kind of in the wrong way. But restoring is actually, you have to know what the building looked like at that time period. And they usually restore it to a certain time period when it's the most significant. And this is usually done only for museums, basically. Very seldom is it done otherwise.

Reconstruct, we have a few that's been reconstructed. Usually, if it's like heavily damaged, Iniki, or something like that, then reconstruction is an alternative. We don't really like that one as an alternative.

Remodel is just totally not taking its historic nature into consideration, and refurbishing, or renovating. Renovating/remodel is kind of the same. In our office, we seldom use that word: remodel. It has kind of a negative connotation for historic preservation.

What we're going to look at is rehabilitate, which is generally – it's kind of a remodeling, but following the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and it's generally for a new use, or

a different use. It's adaptive reuse. So the Secretary of the Interior Standards for rehabilitation was actually set out for the tax credit. So that's the brochure I gave to you guys. It's really about getting tax credits for rehabilitation. So this was set up by the Federal government in a way to encourage the use of these older buildings. So rehabilitation is returning the property to a state of utility, but taking into account its contemporary use, and also the current code, and all that stuff. So some things are just really impossible to totally restore, so rehabilitation is the most common treatment for historic properties especially, buildings.

So the first standard is you try and use the property for its original purpose. Of course, sometimes that's impossible, but one or one that requires minimal change to the defining characteristic. For example, like 'Iolani Palace, now it's a museum, so of course, it's restored. So this is an example of being restored. And the use has very minimal damage to it.

And this is the YMCA on O`ahu. While it's no longer a YMCA, it's now offices, they've tried to keep the defining characteristics of the building like the windows, and the pattern of it. Keep it open instead of putting up all these little walls. They tried to keep their public spaces very intact. So they have all their original tile work there. And even now part of it is the State Art Museum. I don't know if anybody's been there since it's opened, but they have agreed to keep the very character-defining spaces with the tile work intact. And then the side offices are where they're changing mostly.

So this is their courtyard. We've always had a little fight with the State. This doesn't show up, but there's a pool right past this. And we always want them to keep it because that was part of the Y, and it's got all this nice tile work, and everybody who go in there wants to fill it in. It's a danger.

And also like some places like the brewery, it can't be used as a brewery anymore. The interior space can't be maintained. It's a huge space, and it's kind of unmarketable. This is a picture of them doing the rehab process. And actually, this isn't a picture of their interior, but it looks close. Actually, they completely gutted the interior on that one.

So retain and preserve historic character. So the next one is actually to avoid the removal of these features. Even if you're not going to use them, per se, don't take them away. Like this, is an old warehouse. And the character-defining features of this are the rhythm of the columns, and the glue-laminate beams on the top, the wood beams. And they turned it into a shopping center, and they got tax credits for it. They kept the beams that were all exposed. The columns are all exposed. But it's a totally different use.

And like this one is showing the capitals, the top of the columns, are really fancy, and they've got all this decorative detailing. And so instead of just jamming a wall into it,

they carefully cut around the capital to keep it even though that wall is not original. And they even stayed away from the ceiling. Here's a closer picture of how they had to actually cut the gyp board to match the molding on this.

Or like this one is – they enclosed their lanai, but it still has that feeling of an open lanai. It's just all screened in. And they kept the columns, and they put the screens away from the columns.

And here's like a not-so-good example of how you rehab although the essential shape is still there. See the one on the right is the original. It's got all these glass windows. And the one on the left totally obliterated the front of it. And then the top had this art deco lettering. It's hard to see, but it had art deco lettering, and a lot of detailing, and they just put tow tung on it, I think.

Here's another not-so-good example. This is what it was looking like under construction, but you can see it's kind of a brick. And you can imagine what it looked like, and this is what they did with it. This is not following the Secretary of the Interior Standards. That's a total remodel.

The next one is to recognize each property as a record of its time, and not to undertake changes that create a false sense of historical development. And this is a really difficult – this is probably the most difficult one for people to follow. We get – my favorite comment from architects is, "I'm going to make it more historical than it is right now," or "This is how Dickey would've done it." And that's not how it is. And our duty is not to recreate history like this one is. The two styles may have been done in a similar timeframe, but they really don't go together for one thing. And it's this false sense of historical development that we discourage.

Here's another one. It kind of has this colonial bottom with a different Italianate top or different style. It's totally a different style, but not that it wasn't in the same time period, or like kind of a Western storefront with the masonry on the top.

And to that false sense of development, this is one that you really wouldn't know unless you knew, but these are all totally conjecture. Someone thought in their mind this is what it should be, but we don't know that. So we kind of worry about this kind of – putting in something that you think belongs, but you don't know if it belongs.

Ms. Duensing: Can we make a comment on that?

Ms. Moy: Sure.

Ms. Duensing: Because I think this is something that we've been talking about in relationship to Lahaina with wrought iron things holding up signs. Wrought iron

“brackets,” I guess, is the word I was looking for. And the false sense of history. The one building we discussed a couple months ago was they had put on the mermaid-type thing, whatever that little piece of decoration was. And it really has no place in Lahaina because it wouldn't have been there during its turn of development as a whaling center or a plantation-type town.

Ms. Moy: Yeah, that's one of the most difficult ones to convey to especially, architects. I mean, I'm one too. And your architects are trying to make something that's beautiful. But they have to – what's difficult to understand is what belongs and what doesn't. And like this, there's nothing really horribly wrong with it. I mean, I don't terribly disagree with it. This is in China Town. I just don't really agree with the bay windows, which I think belongs more in San Francisco than in China Town. But this is a very common thing. People think, okay, it's that same time period that they're going to do. We had a big disagreement with Ben Lee over another building, which he brought us these pictures that were beautiful buildings in New Orleans, and he wanted to do that to a building in China Town. So it was, no, it doesn't really belong in China Town.

And this is another one that – this becomes the difference between restoration and rehabilitation. Our office likes to retain and – under rehabilitation, preserve changes that have acquired significance in their own right. So for example– Sorry, this is not that good of a slide because you can't see what's on top, but that art deco came after. It was probably maybe neoclassical or something. You know, more with the columns, and a kind of Roman-looking building. And then they put in the art deco probably in the '30s or the late '20s. And so by now it's achieved the significance on its own. So rather than take that out, and try and restore it to the neoclassical, we try to encourage keeping the art deco if it's a significant thing in itself.

As in the Hawai'i Theater where they wanted to take down the neon lights – well, they actually did take down the neon sign, but they're supposed to restore it: the neon sign. They're going to put it back. They wanted to restore it to the original neoclassical awning that was there in the beginning, but our argument was this was up since the '30s, so everybody remembers this. What's significant in most people's mind is this neon sign. It doesn't necessarily match the style, but because it's been there so long, and everybody just remembers it that way that we asked them to keep it.

Ms. Duensing: Question: does the significance also fall within the 50-year history criteria?

Ms. Moy: It is relevant unless it's – like it would have to follow the same criteria for the Register. So if it follows the same criteria, if it falls under there, if it's significant for any of those reasons that's the same as on the Register, and it's 50 years old.

Or like this is another example: the Board of Water Supply. The building on the right,

the very plain one is the older building. That's I think like 1918 or something like that. And this one is – the newer building was built in 1952, I think. So it just turned 50 years old. But our office believes that that is a significant piece of architecture that we wouldn't want to see somebody say, "Oh, we should restore it to the old." And if you compare it to the old one, it's actually a much more beautiful building, I think.

Preserve distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques, or examples of craftsmanship. This goes to looking at what defines the character of a place, and to try and keep what's there. Like for instance, a lot of times new codes require fire walls or something like that. But instead of like just totally obliterating that wall, we tell them to – they can enclose it. According to code, they have to enclose it, but rather than taking away that column and the arches that they just enclose it from the other side. Do something to keep it.

And there's another example where it's kind of chopped up into spaces now, but they kept the ceiling. They kept those columns, and the top of the columns, the capitals, because they are what makes this building.

And here's one that's in Kaua'i. So the character-defining features of this before Iniki were the wood construction. And you can't see it from this side, but the next one shows its most defining feature: the round bottom with the square top. And unfortunately, Iniki took down one-half of the building, but they were able to restore it using the tax credits, and following the Secretary of the Interior Rehabilitation Standards. So it's Subway Sandwich. It's actually a fast food place. So it's not impossible.

And this is just a small example of – like the defining features of this house is just very simple. So the simpler the building is actually the harder it is to follow the Secretary of the Interior Standards because they're so few features that can be changed before you completely obliterate the character of it. And so this one, the in-filled the center, and it's like a totally different building.

So repair rather than replace. And if it has to be replaced, then replace in-kind, or with the same, if possible, or at least make it look the same for the important missing features. So this is like decaying wood. Of course, that happens all the time. But the Secretary of the Interior Standards encourages rather than wholesale replacing all of that, you know, it's okay if it's not perfect. You can use epoxy. Sometimes if beams are all termite-eaten, they just leave that beam in there, and they put in another beam that actually carries the weight. But the idea is that the actual historic fabric is important. And it depends on the site. But like say Damien's Church site where they're extremely careful to keep every single piece of wood even if it was deteriorated, and they tried to epoxy where they could. Or if not, they just left it in its deteriorated state because it's so important that Father Damien had touched it, and the history behind the real thing is so important.

And this is somebody painstakingly copying a banister I think from `Iolani Palace. These two are `Iolani Palace restoration shots.

And here's one in Ewa where they actually did go through and checked most pieces of wood. And instead of taking out everything, they just replaced where they needed. So you can see the new boards. And they replaced it with the same kind of – they had to actually mill all that wood. And also, if you are going to replace, make sure that it's done accurately. So if it's not there that there's photographs, and then you can replace. But if there's no photographs, we try to encourage to go as simple as possible.

And here's like – this is a reconstruction project. This is Rice Mill in Hanalei. Actually, it got knocked down twice: once by Iwa, once by Iniki. But luckily they had HABS drawings so they were able to rebuild or reconstruct.

So avoid treatments such as sandblasting. Cleaning is the gentlest means possible. And I think most people have come around to knowing this one. We don't really have too much problems with people on this one. I mean, there's been so much evidence. I think even in China Town where they sandblasted one, and so it just started to decay. It wasn't meant to be cleaned that way.

And another thing that always happens is like a lot of times, people want to take off the stucco that's over the brick because they like the brick. I mean, brick is beautiful and you don't blame them. But most of the time if it was stuccoed over, that brick was not meant to be exposed. So then they find it starting to decay again.

This is a picture of someone cleaning. This is really the gentlest means possible.

And this is protect and preserve significant archaeological resources affected by a project. Or if it's going to be disturbed to undertake mitigation measures, and that's kind of simple enough. If there's an archaeological site in the development, make sure either you use it, and highlight it like the way a lot of the Big Island developments did, or you record it.

And do not destroy historic materials in the process of attaching new additions. Differentiate new work from old, but make it compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features. And this is one of those gray areas that people have a real hard time with. I mean, it's sort of a taste thing. Like for example, this one I think was done in the '80s. And this actually won some kind of an architectural award for its addition. Now, in the '80s, that was the interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior Rehabilitation Guidelines, and so it is subject to interpretation. So this was thought to be the proper addition because it's very differentiated. It's about the same height as the other floor. I think its patterning is not quite the same, but anyway, it won an award, I think.

So this is another one. Same kind of idea where it's different, very different.

Ms. Duensing: So today, are you saying you wouldn't recommend these? They're too different?

Ms. Moy: Today, I think the recommendation now is more like to differentiate it enough so the trained eye can see the difference. So like this one, that addition is on the left-hand side. And you can tell by the very top, the cornice, it's simpler. The one on the right got all this little detailing in it. And even the little triangle on top of the arch you can see is also different. So they differentiated it subtly. And so this I think has become the more standard now that people follow.

And this is a library. And this is actually three additions. And you can tell if you look carefully, there's one that goes in, and there's one that comes back out. The one that goes in is a very early addition done by Dickey. And the one on the right is a fairly recent addition. So if you look carefully, you can see that there's a slight differentiation in the treatment, but yet it looks like one building. At first glance, you would never know. And I think this is the more common treatment, I think. And you can see here close up where there's just small differences.

Or this is like, you know, you have to do a fire exit. So this is one solution. I'm not totally keen on it, but they wanted to keep the staircase, which is a very character-defining feature of this. And this is a Mainland slide, so I'm not even sure where this is. So they glassed it in, I guess, and made it fire-protected that way somehow. I'm not sure how you can do that, but—

Ms. Sablas: I have a question about the stairway. We had – when the Lahaina Methodist Church came, they wanted an outside stairway. And I don't know if it was for safety reasons.

Ms. Duensing: It was a fire exit because they only had one exit.

Ms. Sablas: And I think we recommended against it because it would be going against the character of the building.

Ms. Duensing: Yeah, we recommended against the placement that they wanted because what we wanted to do is because they wanted to put it on the side of the building where you could see it from the major front facade, we wanted to put it in the rear. And by putting in the rear, we would've been following the Secretary of the Interior Guidelines by not impacting the historic facade of the building.

Ms. Sablas: And I remember that because you guided us through that process. To me, it was a safety issue, but the guidelines are very clear that these are things we cannot

do.

Ms. Moy: Safety will always govern, but it has to be a true safety reason. Sometimes codes are just done for safety, but to the extreme, right? So a lot of times that are really safe have to change because of current code. And so, I think there is a UBC code for historic buildings that say something to the effect that it cannot be less safe than it is. So for instance, guardrails, that's another big one. The older buildings a lot of times have maybe 30 inches and now it's 42 inches. Well, sometimes it depends on where it is, or what the chances are of a kid being there, and stuff. We can do variances for historic buildings that say you don't have to raise it to 42 inches. It's perfectly safe the way it is.

Ms. Duensing: And I think another good example getting back to the accessibility thing is the Lahaina Store, and the huge controversy over getting rid of those stairs. The building owners wanted to do that and they eventually got their request. And I think SHPD along with me tried to stick to our guns, and say no, that was a character-defining feature of the building that should stay. And since they put in a new access on the secondary facade, that would've been the appropriate way to provide entrance into the building without the stairs.

Ms. Sablas: And some of the arguments for removal of the stairs if I remember correctly was that the stairway didn't have any defining characters.

Ms. Duensing: Well, the architect didn't feel it was a defining feature, and I did.

Ms. Sablas: But that was a major issue.

Ms. Duensing: Yeah, we had two meetings on just the stairs alone.

Ms. Moy: The thing with the Secretary of the Interior Standards is they are guidelines. They are standards. They are guidelines. It depends on what you're doing. It depends on what the new use is. It depends on the codes of the area. So things fall a lot into a rather gray area. So it is very difficult. Like it's our opinion versus another person's opinion. Sometimes it is different.

Ms. Duensing: And I think another interesting note on the Lahaina Store thing is one of the things I brought up to the attention of property owners is that by not following a lot of the interpretations that SHPD was recommending on rehabilitation of the structure, they would be jeopardizing the chance for tax credits in this rehabilitative project. And they said they weren't going to go for that anyway, which leaves them a great more level of leeway to do whatever they want to the building. But unfortunately, this may be my opinion, but I don't think it is, is you should still be held to the design guidelines and standards because they are in a historic district too. Would you agree with that, Tonia,

or not?

Ms. Moy: Sure. But because they're not getting their tax benefits, of course, then it's going to be up to the County really to enforce. And even us, we don't really enforce. It's just that if you want your tax credit, and we don't agree to it, then you won't get your tax credit if we don't think it meets the standards.

Ms. Duensing: Are there a lot of property owners in this State taking advantage of tax credits? Because all that has to go through your office, correct?

Ms. Moy: Yeah, very few take advantage of the tax credits. For a little while, there was quite a number, but there's been very, very few in the last— I think Bank of Haiku was the last one that I remember taking any tax credits.

Ms. Sablas: Why do you suppose it is? Is it because more costly? It's sort of like the argument that it's more costly to go that—

Ms. Duensing: From what I've observed since I've been on the Commission, I think owners would rather do what they want with the building to maximize their profit as using the structure rather than get back their return in tax credits. They can make more money by using the building as they please than they can by using those tax credits.

Ms. Moy: Which is possible. Say you're going to get a hundred square foot more rental in the long run that might make you more money than the \$20,000 tax credit you could get, or something like that. I don't know why they're not taking tax credits. We try and encourage people to, but—

Ms. Duensing: Like in the Maui Pine project that we looked at yesterday when the architectural history report was put in that. There were three pages of explanations on how the system worked, and what the Secretary of the Interior Standards were. I put that in there, and then also explained the tax credits to them that they could be eligible for if they decide to rehabilitate some of those structures. So I guess it's part of our job to try to educate too.

Ms. Moy: Yeah, if you can.

Ms. Sablas: Bu then I'm also appreciating that we're being educated. I wish I had gone through this process earlier.

Ms. Moy: I know. It's hard. Well, this is just another addition where it's fairly seamless. It's a rather large addition. It's from right over that archway. To the left of the archway, from that point on is an addition. Some argue it's a little too seamless. That's also again, a judgement call. The windows are a little different, you could argue. But it is

rather seamless. So this kind of thing, we ask to make sure you have it documented. But it's a substantial addition. I'm showing this just to show also that rehabilitation doesn't mean you can't do anything. Just because it's a historic building doesn't mean you can't do anything to the building. There are substantial things you can do.

Ms. Duensing: I have another question on a building that we discussed yesterday that you had reviewed. It was for an addition to a plantation-style home in Lahaina that they were going to build a carport, and then another big addition. And you asked them to make it separate, which I agreed with, but I was surprised that you thought it was okay to have such a big mass added to a relatively small simple house.

Ms. Moy: Well, for one thing, as you know, we can't tell them not to build for their own house. I mean, we try not to tell people what to do with their own house. And for another thing, as you will see in the Secretary of the Interior Standards, it doesn't say you cannot build. And here, this one is one of my favorite examples of what follows the rehab standards. On the left is a totally modern building. On the right is a historic building. It follows in massing. It's big. It's almost the same size as the regular building. It's up in front. It's connected by that hallway in the middle. That's the only connection. And so, it allows for using property the way an owner wants to. I mean, you know, that's one of the things about adaptive reuse. The owner has to make it useful for themselves. An addition is not out of the question. It would've been really bad if that addition was right in front of this building, or if it had taken out part of the building to attach. But it's done so minimally, and in a similar style even though it's quite big. And this is from the— These slides are from the National Park Service, so it would meet their criteria.

And of course, something like this addition is something that we would not encourage. You can't even see the building, really.

And the next one is do not impair the essential form and integrity of historic property if new additions or construction is undertaken. So that goes back to — actually, that goes back to this one where you can see that it's still a house. It'll be very easy if someday somebody wanted to totally restore that house, and turn it into a museum. They'll probably still keep that addition, but it would be very easy to take off the addition. And the form and the integrity of this building would be kept.

And so here's another example of that. This is the YMCA again. And it's connected to the State Office Tower. So the way they connected it was they left the building totally alone, and put an independent structure next to it, so that all the detailing is still there. You can kind of see on the top like the eaves and the windows.

Ms. Duensing: I think the important thing on that building is they preserved the front facade.

Ms. Moy: Yeah.

Ms. Duensing: The exterior.

Ms. Moy: Yeah, and the main lobby spaces are still there, so that's really nice.

So this is a house that could've done a better job. Again, it's a placement, and what it's blocking that makes a difference. Like here, they put the carport right in the front. They cut off part of their eave to put that carport in. It could've been done much differently. I mean, they don't have a lot of property, but maybe they could've done a one-carport, and not connect it except through one little – just a small connection, although I'm glad it was a flat roof and not a tall roof. That would really obliterate that building.

So this is a bad example: what you don't do when you connect to a historic building.

I just brought a few slides about plantation because I didn't know what we were going to talk: about plantation or the inventory for Lahaina. So just to show some samples of what – I mean, this is very common where the plantation towns are becoming owned by individuals, and everybody wants to have their own little lawn.

This is like an old picture of Ewa. And so it's not to say that fences weren't used. This is where they used those railroad track tie things. No, that's not railroad. Tar...(inaudible)...under the airplane. And the roads.

And then this is what happens to a lot of the towns. On O`ahu, a lot of the plantation towns, everybody buys their own, and this is what happens. So it's not something we can force on people, but I think like Lana`i is still really nice. It's still really got that plantation country atmosphere. So I think it would be very good to encourage people to not put that, or you can put this, and look how much better that is. At least you can see. I mean, it's almost clear, not quite, but you can still have your fence. But just to encourage people to think about it before they put up that CMU wall.

And this is Ewa. And in Ewa, this is your normal kind of city and county road where you have your curbs on the side, and your sidewalks, and very nice and straight. And in Ewa what they did was they put the drainage down the center of the road instead so you could have sort of like a – just that dirt-to-road-feeling of plantation. They did insist on widening it a little still, though.

Okay, that's the end of the slide presentation, but I'm sure there are questions.

Ms. Duensing: Thank you, Tonia. Are there any questions for Tonia?

Mr. Lon Whelchel: I'd like to go back to that classical addition where they had eliminated

the dental...(inaudible)...eaves.

Ms. Moy: The Bank of America one?

Mr. Whelchel: Would you ever do that? You have an existing building, and you do an addition that you're trying to match, and you deliberately eliminate some of the features. To me, it looks like they didn't eliminate them. They budget-cut them.

Ms. Moy: Actually, that is following the standards, though, because one of the standards is you're not supposed to try and fool people into thinking that this is what the building was like. You want people to know that it is an addition. Now currently, it's the trained eye that can tell it's an addition. So if papers get lost, or whatever, somebody can go in and tell them it's an addition. They don't want to fool people. And of course, they tend to simplify because it's cheaper for one thing. But to replicate every detail – unless you're replicating a detail that came off, then you replicate. But if it's a new addition, then it's not encouraged to copy exactly.

Mr. Whelchel: I wasn't familiar with that.

Ms. Duensing: The way I look at it is, like Tonia says, you're not trying to fool anybody into thinking that the whole building is historic. Also think of it as you replicate a building, and then you've got your element of fake historicity. That's what like Disneyland does on their Main Street America. We don't want to do that.

Ms. Sablas: Again, I go back to the Lahaina Store because I don't know a lot of what you know. And you weren't there when we had that discussion, but we talked at length about the addition of the side area.

Ms. Duensing: Yeah, I was there.

Ms. Sablas: That's something that would not be recommended. They replicated the facade of a front to the side.

Ms. Duensing: They basically imitated the front facade, and put it on that side facade that was bare except for the outlines of – you know, there were arches on the side. But the curious thing is, is I think SHPD said that that part was okay of that project, or not.

Ms. Moy: I don't know.

Ms. Duensing: I mean, I disagreed with that. I don't remember what you folks said about that.

Ms. Moy: I don't know.

Ms. Sablas: And again, the argument on the developer's side, if I remember, is because they wanted to make use of the side area that was primarily not used, an alleyway, and turn it more into a mall. So by replicating the front, it would just enhance the visual from the mall. So if that was the rationale. But again, preservation-wise, historically-wise, from what I'm seeing that was not really the proper thing to do.

Ms. Duensing: And that's why I fought that as hard I did. And I guess I was committed to trying to convince not to do that because I just think that that was such a particularly significant building, and now its integrity is gone if you look at it strictly speaking. That would be a subject of debate, too, I suppose.

Ms. Moy: Replication up to a certain point is okay so that it looks at first glance maybe the same. But if it's detail for detail where it's going to fool the public into thinking that's how it was originally, that's not following the standards.

Ms. Duensing: Were you on the Commission when we did the review of the armory plan on Market Street?

Ms. Sablas: Yes.

Ms. Duensing: I remember we discussed this then because they were putting an addition onto that, and we had this discussion at our meeting is that the idea was to imitate the character of the building without replicating it. But now, have you driven by there since they gutted the building? I'm wondering how much of it is going to be left anyway. It's amazing.

Ms. Sablas: What I was thinking when we left Lahaina, I should've thought about just going and checking out the status of how Lahaina Store is coming. We might have an opportunity if we go back a little earlier today. Maybe we can just go by because this is the project that stands in mind for me. That was before your time, Lon, but this took up a lot of our discussion. And if we had something like this for the Commissioners before, it would have really have helped someone like me. I mean, I don't have that background, and yet we were in a position. . . .

Ms. Duensing: . . . are on the web. You can download them. And I had brought several copies of what I thought was applicable to the Lahaina Store thing into our meetings. But if we have questions, we can look on the web, and get what the Secretary of the Interior recommends.

Ms. Moy: It gets into more detail on the web.

Ms. Duensing: I think if we would practice looking at it more often, we'd understand it better, though.

Ms. Moy: Like I said earlier, a lot of things fall in a gray area. So usually nobody is totally wrong. Very seldom is it this or that. There's a lot of gray in between. Some things are really clearly off the standard, but there's much more falling in between where you're kind of off than right on the standards. Most things fall in that gray area, and that's the difficult part. So probably the more projects you see, the better feeling you'll get for it. And like my ex-boss used to always say, we're second generation bureaucrats, so as the generations get lower, we get worse, and we get harder because in some ways it's easier to follow the purer version. It's harder to get into the gray areas. And that's where the longer you're at it, the easier it gets to make the decision. In the beginning, you're going to fall way onto one side because that's the standard, and you want to follow it, and you sort of lean way to one side. But the more you see, probably the more the gray areas will kind of weigh out. But there is a lot of gray.

Ms. Duensing: Yeah, and I think the building we did yesterday with the addition to the house was a good example because I looked at that, and I thought, oh, it's just too big. It's going to overwhelm the house, but maybe in this case, they didn't really have a whole lot of choice if they're going to maximize their property, and use it as they want to. So I guess in some cases, you have to just say, well, it's the right thing to do. Maybe I don't like it, but this man needs to use his property, and at least he's done the best design he can come up with for the historic district.

Ms. Moy: That one there, yeah. We talked about lowering it more, but he has a boat, and we talked about it. And they wanted a certain square footage, and there was only that space on the side. But he was going to keep the house intact, and do a small a connection as possible.

Ms. Duensing: And we have to give him credit for that.

Ms. Moy: Yeah.

Ms. Sablas: My concern for that particular project was that it might be changing the dynamics of the neighborhood, but again, he showed examples of neighboring areas that have already non-conforming second stories.

Ms. Duensing: But that's not necessarily a good reason for...(inaudible)...

Mr. Whelchel: That's a gray area.

Ms. Duensing: Yeah, and I guess that's why I pointed that out. We did have that gray area yesterday. And Lon came up with a good idea. He wanted a girl to go on part of it too.

Ms. Moy: Any more questions? Any more questions about anything else that our office

does?

Ms. Duensing: Regarding the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines, and demolition permits, and everything, and Lana`i being where we are today, it's probably nine months ago, or maybe a year ago the First Hawaiian Bank wanted to demolish their building up here. And they were going to get Federal funding to rebuild.

Ms. Moy: Because it's FDIC.

Ms. Duensing: Right. Whatever happened to that? Because that was to go through Section 106, and they kind of just withdrew the project. Because if we have time, I'd like to walk by that building, and see what the – is it really falling down? It doesn't look bad.

Ms. Moy: I don't know. I don't know what happened to that.

Ms. Duensing: Yeah, it would be good to do an inspection of that as long as we're here because that was on our agenda last year, and the project just disappeared, which is good because the building is still standing. Any other questions? So if there are no more questions relating to the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines for Tonia, also on our agenda was the discussion on proceeding with the Lana`i plantation camp inventory.

C. DISCUSSION ON PROCEEDING WITH THE LANA`I PLANTATION CAMP INVENTORY

Ms. Duensing: I'm not sure what Wayne wanted to talk to us about. Last night at our meeting, Ralph had mentioned that they went out, and did inventory sheets, and black and white photographs of 200 structures here. Isn't that what he said? I think he used 200 as a figure. Were those transmitted to the State or not?

Ms. Moy: Not that I know of, although, maybe.

Ms. Duensing: And I wonder if that should also be a letter that the Planning Department should follow up on to confirm that they actually did do the inventory sheets, and the black and white photos.

Ms. Moy: And you can e-mail me and remind me to go look.

Ms. Duensing: Yeah, I will on Monday. And maybe if we could just follow up with Ralph and find out if they did that. And are they going to be transmitted to the State, and the County for record-keeping purposes or something.

Ms. Moy: It may have. I'm not sure. Things come in, and I don't necessarily

open...(inaudible)...

Ms. Duensing: Yeah, but I don't know how much we can say about that because I guess we already considered it on our past project review, and they got exempted from doing a full-blown inventory and history of the place. So unless we can lobby them to—

Ms. Moy: They're supposed to do a history, aren't they?

Ms. Duensing: Well, the history in that document was one and a half pages long. I don't know how they got it all into one and a half pages. I think it was double-spaced too. But, yeah, there was no historian on it.

Ms. Moy: Was this the one done by Munekiyo?

Ms. Duensing: Yeah. At least the document we got only had a page and a half.

Ms. Sablas: And I remember the sentiment at least from our CRC, and my point of view, too, that there was a bit of a time schedule on for whatever they did. And it meant that the Lana`i people could get an opportunity at purchasing their homes, but they had some time schedule.

Ms. Moy: I thought they were purchasing their homes already.

Ms. Duensing: Yeah, and I don't have anything against the project, Lori. I just don't see why it wasn't documented professionally and appropriately. Because if you can pay a big planning firm to handle all this for you, you can hire the guy to go out, and do the history research, and a professionally-done inventory that's not done by just the planning guy that occupies that desk at their office. I mean, when you're spending that much money, it's not the idea that I don't want the people to get the homes. I just wanted to see the report properly done because we're CLG, and we're supposed to be following the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines, and what they did doesn't follow that. And part of the problem is in the exemption they got from the County government, and I guess we can't do anything about that.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

E. NEW BUSINESS - None

F. NEXT MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 3, 2003

Ms. Duensing: I was talking to Daren earlier about this. And I'm going to be going to the National Trust Conference which is the end of September, and it'll be that first week of October. And if Lori goes, that would mean two of our members would be gone the first

Thursday of the month. So possibly, if the agenda items permit, we could defer that meeting, and reschedule it to the following week, or something, if that's a possibility?

Mr. Daren Suzuki: It would probably be canceled anyway. We have our Hawai'i Congress of Planning Official's Conference.

Ms. Duensing: Oh, yeah, that's the next week, too. Can we just see what we have on our agenda for the next month? Maybe talk about it in a couple weeks, and see what we can figure out.

Ms. Sablas: Do we have to have it on a Thursday, or can we have it on another day?

Ms. Duensing: See what you guys figure out and let us know. If there's nothing on the agenda, we can just postpone it to November. That's fine too.

F. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

TREMAINE K. BALBERDI
Commission Support Clerk

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Members Present:

Dawn Duensing, Chair
Lon Whelchel
J. Ke`eaumoku Kapu
Lori Sablas
Solomon Kaopuiki

Members Excused:

Milton Pa
Erik Fredericksen
Lisa Rotunno-Hazuka

Cultural Resources Commission
Draft Minutes - September 5, 2003
Page 18

Ku`ulei Haina

Others:

Daren Suzuki, County Planning Department
Tonia Moy, State Department of Land and Natural Resources, Historic Preservation
Division