MAUI COUNTY CULTURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION
REGULAR MINUTES
MARCH 7, 2019

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Cultural Resources Commission (Commission) was called to order by Chairperson Ivan Lay at approximately 11:00 a.m., Thursday, March 7, 2019, 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 Lay: Maui County Cultural Resources Commission now in session, 11 am, March 7.

B. PUBLIC TESTIMONY - At the discretion of the Chair, public testimony may also be taken when each agenda item is discussed, except for contested cases under Chapter 91, HRS. Individuals who cannot be present when the agenda item is discussed may testify at the beginning of the meeting instead and will not be allowed to testify again when the agenda item is discussed unless new or additional information will be offered. Maximum time limits of at least three minutes may be established on individual testimony by the Commission. More information on oral and written testimony can be found below.

Chair Lay: If anybody wishes to testify on any of the agenda items before the agenda comes up, they may do so, you have three minutes. If you do testify at this time, you won't be allowed to testify when the agenda item does come up. At this point, does anyone wish to testify before the agenda comes up? Okay. Ian, you wanted to discuss something before we -- we started today?

Mr. Bassford: Yes, just for disclosure. I am with SCS Archaeology and I have been in some discussion over the Hana Bridges Replacement Project so I believe during that agenda item, I need to recuse myself.

Chair Lay: Okay. Go ahead, Tanya Greig.

Ms. Lee-Greig: So Tanya Lee-Greig.

Chair Lay: Yes, sorry.

Ms. Lee-Greig: While I was with Cultural Surveys, we participated and we were part of the team for the Hana Bridges Preservation Plan, so I'm not sure if I need to recuse myself or not.

Chair Lay: And as that, you guys just comments, right, comments and history? Was there more involvement than that?

Mr. Bassford: The formal projects, our survey work has not commenced yet --

Chair Lay: Okay.

Mr. Bassford: So, right now, it's conceptual.

Chair Lay: Okay. But I mean if the Commission agrees, I would like to hear if you have any comments, you know, not that you'll be able to vote, you know. I'd be willing to hear some of your comments if you do have comments. Everyone agree on that? Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bassford: Thank you, Chair.

Chair Lay: Okay, moving on to C, this is a Resolution thanking outgoing members. Oh, any public testimony on that? Sorry. If not, we gotta close it too. No public testimony? We're now closing public testimony. Excuse me.

C. RESOLUTIONS THANKING OUTGOING MEMBERS LORI SABLAS AND FRANK SKOWRONSKI

Chair Lay: Now we're moving on to agenda item number C. We're thanking Lori Sablas and Frank Skowronski. Thank you very much for your services. You guys have been a great asset to this Commission. We appreciate -- you guys have been very -- came all the time just about. Your comments have been very good for all of us, you know, even if it was on the opposite, it's always good to hear what the both sides are, and you guys have always been strong advocates for bringing out the truths and everything about the projects and we do appreciate that, and we look forward to you coming back in a couple of years. And, at this time, Annalise, you wanna do a presentation?

Ms. Kehler: Thank you, Chair. I'm going to read the Resolutions thanking both of these Commissioners, so I'll start with Commissioner Sablas, so this Resolution says:

Whereas, Lori Sablas has served the County of Maui since January 2017 as a member of the Cultural Resources Commission; and

Whereas, Ms. Sablas's term of office expires on March 31, 2019; and

Whereas, Ms. Sablas has served with distinction and has performed her duties in the highest professional manner; now therefore

Be it resolved that the Maui County Cultural Resources Commission hereby commends Ms. Sablas for her dedication and untiring public service to the people of Maui County and expresses their sincere appreciation for her services, and they extend their best wishes in her future endeavors; and

Furthermore, be it resolved that copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Michael P. Victorino, Mayor of the County of Maui; and the Honorable Kelly King, Council Chair of the Maui County Council.

Ms. Kehler: So thank you for your service, Commissioner Sablas. And I'm going to read now the Resolution thanking outgoing Member, Frank Skowronski:

Whereas, Francis Skowronski has served the County of Maui since October 2013, being reappointed in April 2014, as a member of the Cultural Resources Commission; and

Whereas, Mr. Skowronski's term of office expires on March 31, 2019; and

Whereas, Mr. Skowronski has served with distinction and has performed his duties in the highest professional manner; now therefore

Be it resolved that the Maui County Cultural Resources Commission hereby commends Mr. Skowronski for his dedication and untiring public service to the people of Maui County, expresses their sincere appreciation for his services, and extends their best wishes in his future endeavors; and

Furthermore, be it resolved that copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Michael P. Victorino, Mayor of the County of Maui; and the Honorable Kelly King, Council Chair of the Maui County Council.

Ms. Kehler: Thank you, Commissioner Skowronski. And, Chair, if I may, I'm just going to give them lei really quick.

Chair Lay: Okay.

Ms. Kehler: Okay, and so with each Resolution, there's a Certificate from the Mayor thanking these Members for their service, and I really appreciate both of these Members, they've participated in almost every meeting that we've had since they've been appointed to serve, and they've provided excellent comments and have pushed me to do things, and I really appreciate them and they're going to be missed.

Chair Lay: Okay, moving on to item D, Communications.

Chair Lay read the following agenda item description into the record:

D. COMMUNICATIONS

1. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highways Administration inviting the Cultural Resources Commission to participate in National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 consultation for the proposed Hana Highway Bridge Improvements Project, involving the following

bridges along Hana Highway (Route 360): Kailua Stream Bridge, Makanali Stream Bridge, Puohokamoa Stream Bridge, Kopiliula Stream Bridge, Ulaino Stream Bridge, and Mokulehua Stream Bridge

The Commission may advise the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highways Administration in carrying out its historic preservation responsibilities, pursuant to Subsection 2.88.060.A, Maui County Code

Chair Lay: Do we have any, besides what we've read, is anybody going to make a presentation on this or anything?

Ms. Kehler: Chair, yes, we do have some consultants here who are going to be talking a little bit about this project, and I'll have them introduce themselves.

Chair Lay: Thank you. Go ahead. Yes.

Mr. Parker: Aloha and good morning. My name is Thomas Parker, I'm actually with the Federal Highway Administration, Central Federal Lands Highway Division. It's a unique position within the Federal Highway Administration that I can get into. I went ahead and loaded up our presentation that we've been giving around the island to several communities regarding this project. We're -- we're very early in the stage of this project, and we're really into scoping phase. And so, like the Chair indicated, so we have six bridges that have been identified as part of this project: the Kailua Stream Bridge, Makanali, Puohokamoa, Kopiliula, Ulaino, and Mokulehua. So those six bridges are scattered along the -- the route. You should have received an information packet as part of that letter that identified some of the details regarding those six bridges; hopefully, everyone did receive that.

And so, you know, it's important to understand who I am and what my role is because I'm -- I'm probably not the typical participant that you see on projects such as this. I'm sure you're familiar with the DOT and their role in delivering projects, but, like I said, I'm with this unique branch, the Central Federal Lands Highway Division, and as such, we -- we operate in a unique role in the Federal Government and Federal Highways, so the DOT is a delivering entity that, they oversee and design transportation projects, and they oversee the construction of those projects. The typical role for the Federal Highways is a stewardship and oversight role, so they oversee the Federal dollars that go to the DOT, ensure they comply with Federal requirements, statutes, etcetera, but our role in the Federal Lands office is much like a DOT, we actually oversee the design and construction of projects with internal staff as well, and because of that unique role, we've entered into a partnership that's been ongoing since 2013 with the Hawaii DOT, a peer-to-peer partnership, so that we can bring our expertise to the table, we can learn from the Hawaii

DOT because of the unique challenges that exist within this island, and we can both grow as an organization. And so because of that, you may notice I don't have that good of a tan and it's because I'm from Lakewood, Colorado, but we cover a 14-state region within our office and we're very fortunate to have Hawaii being one of those states, and so we deliver projects around the west, southwest, and the far south-southwest of Hawaii, and we deliver mostly projects for Federal Land Management agencies, such as the Park Service, we just recently completed the resurfacing of Haleakala, if you -- if you've been up there, you would have seen our presence in that work that we oversaw, but because, obviously Hana is not associated with Federal Lands, and that's where the unique partnership with the DOT came into effect is that we were actually delivering projects that typically would be delivered by DOT, but through this partnership, we're delivering projects that they deliver side-by-side with the DOT.

So here are some of the services that we -- we offer. We have a full design staff, full geo-technical engineer surveying, hydraulic engineers, I'm a project manager within this office, and then we also have construction oversight, project engineers who actually oversee the construction of projects, so we're a cradle-to-grave delivery organization as we like to say. We can plan, design, and oversee construction of transportation projects.

So in 2013, we actually entered into that formal memorandum of agreement with the DOT, it included 12 different bridge projects around the islands - Kauai, Oahu, Big Island, and Maui - it also included route jobs, Lahaina Bypass 1B2, that design build project that was completed was also overseen by -- by our office, and the Hana Bridges that's in front of you now is a continuation of that, so here are some of the suite of projects that we've been working on even before this MOA was executed: Saddle Road, on the Big Island, we've been working on that since the '80s and '90s, throughout the -- the development of that very long project; the Kealia Pond Boardwalk, if you've walked that, that was another project that, on the island, that we oversaw; the Emergency Access Road during the recent volcanic activity in Hawaii Volcano's National Park, that was our engagement as well with the DOT for -- so we're scattered around the island. Some of the key projects that we have -- have worked on. Low fun fact about Lahaina Bypass, that geo-synthetic reinforced soil bridge at Punakea is the tallest GRS bridge in the United States and it happens to be on this island, so some unique construction techniques using the latest technologies have been employed by our office. Here's a project that we completed on Oahu, the Kipapa Gulch Bridge rehabilitation that was recently completed, definitely a challenging project, 35,000 vehicles a day cross this bridge that we had to manage rehabilitation of during -- during, you know, people's working lives. Some of the projects we've done on Kauai include Bridge 7E, which is just located at Mile Post 7, west of Lihue, Hanapepe River Bridge is under construction now, Kapaa Stream Bridge is -- we're preparing for award of that, and the roundabout at Mailihuna Road, and the -- we're finalizing design for the Wainiha Stream Bridges up there on Kuhio Highway. On Oahu, we -- I indicated the Kipapa Bridge, which was recently completed, the picture -- there's

the Halona Street Bridge in Downtown Honolulu that was completed, and then we have a design build project on the North Shore of Oahu, Kawela and Nanahu. And we are under construction now on Hilea and Ninole Bridge on Mamalahoa Highway on the southwestern slope of Mauna Loa on the Big Island, outside of the park. So we are engaged in projects around the islands and -- but we are here today to talk to you about the Hana Highway, and I won't go through all of these because this presentation I'm showing you now is what we've been giving to the formal community and you're obviously -- you're very educated about this route.

I'm sure you understand the history of Hana Highway better than most, so it's, you know, as a modern roadway construction, began in the 1800s, officially completed in '26, and paving wasn't completed until 1946 or so, or '44, so, you know, recently, recent activity on that roadway. There's 43 State-owned bridges on the Hawaii -- the Hawaii DOT section of Hana Highway, and, obviously, we're here to talk to you about six of those, but we have a strong understanding of the historic district that exist there, and how these bridges fit within that larger context, and so these bridges were obviously all documented in 2015 in the preservation plan, I heard several were involved in the review and preparation of that preservation plan, but we're here to continue the work on the Hana Highway. We're bringing in our expertise, the engineering, to start to identify solutions and -- and how can we work our way through, so, obviously, there's -- there's a lot of unique character-defining features of the engineering structures along this route.

For these bridges, you have the concrete rubble masonry abutments and guard walls, the bridge railings themselves, the bridge -- the unique bridge construction techniques as well. Some examples of the railings that we have, on the left, you see a solid concrete railing, that's on the Mokulehua Bridge, built in 1908, it's one of the oldest, the oldest on the Hawaii DOT section. Here you have another example, a solid concrete railing but with a parapet on top. And then we have these open-picket style railings as well that exist on these bridges. But the important thing is that it's not just the bridges, it's the -- it's the roadway and the context that it fits within so this is a great photo to show the bridge itself with the -- the view shed beyond that people really come to see and experience the magic of Maui at. Here's an example of those guard walls, the stone guard walls. Here's a recent repair that was completed on those guard walls. Some of them have been overtaken by vegetation as you are very aware, moss growing around. Here, this is Ulaino Bridge. Here's a cut flower nursery just down slope that you can see where these bridges fit right next to the local community, businesses within the area in that larger fabric. Here's an example of the -- some of the abutments that we have on these bridges. You can see that concrete rubble masonry abutment how it is near vertical in these areas and, you know, if you're not familiar, you know, that concrete rubble masonry really is rocks from the local area that have been mortared together and stacked to create these abutment kinda gravity walls, there's no rebar within those structures, very unique techniques, and they echo the time in which they were constructed in the early 1900s.

Some of them do have concrete abutments and piers. And here's another example of that concrete rubble masonry that's actually been built into a bedrock protruding near that stream, and so they were integrated within that -- that landscape.

But, obviously, there's a larger context that we have to consider for Hana Highway and what it represents. These steep hills, the waterfalls that everyone loves to stop at and crowd the road to see, tumbling cliffs, obviously the tropical vegetation in the rainforest that exist there, scenic vistas, tons of unique businesses that operate within this corridor trails, and obviously the wayside parks in Hana and along the way. And so that's important to understand the setting that we're working in when we look at projects, and in my office, that's one of our expertise, because we work in National Parks, we bring -- we appreciate context sensitive solutions and we like to bring that to the table.

So these are the six bridges that have been identified by Hawaii DOT for us to aid in delivery. They've obviously been -- the question probably on everyone's mind: Why these bridges? And it was really based off of every two years Hawaii DOT is required to do bridge inspections, and so they identified deficiencies with load or structural, what have you, and these have been selected based off of their degraded condition, the poor load ratings, and so that's -- that's where we got involved, but, obviously, this is part of a bridge's natural life cycle. The moment that concrete is poured, it has an expiration date, and so we're here to -- to lengthen that life to improve this corridor in that context sensitive way and have a solution that everyone can be satisfied with.

So in your packet, you have details on all of this so I'm not going to read everything about it, but we do have varying ages of bridges: Kailua built in 1929, this one is a 20-foot -- a little over 20-foot wide curb-to-curb travel way; Makanali Stream Bridge, 1928, that one has a 16.4-foot curb-to-curb travel way; we have Puohokamoa Stream, 1912, that's a 15 -- just over 15-foot wide travel way; Kopiliula Stream Bridge, 1926, 14.4-foot travel way, and you can see the East Maui Irrigation head gate is actually bolted onto the side of this structure, so some unique construction there; Ulaino, 1914, 16, just over 16-foot travel way; and Mokulehua, the oldest on the route, 1908, and it is 13.78 travel way, and you also noticed in the packet several are single-span so they just have an abutment, no pier, there's a -- there is a -- a double-span and a triple-span, Mokulehua is actually a triple-span, you can see the two piers that exist within the water on that structure. So varying various bridge types, various ages, all predate even my father's birthday, so they -- they are old structures. Like I said, we look beyond these bridges so we're here in front of the Maui Cultural Resources Commission because we want your input. We are in the data-gathering phase of this project. It's important to understand the -- all the different stakeholders for this important corridor and what those values are, and we want to weave that into our -- whatever transportation solution is identified following in-depth engineering studies.

So what's that process going to look like obviously being a Federal agency, you know, we -- we follow Federal statutes, and we're here doing scoping with your group, we want your feedback, we want your input; we'll take that, we'll take all, we had a public meeting on Tuesday in the Hana community, last night in Wailuku, tonight in Keanae, so we're meeting with different communities, gather their input, and we're compiling all of that to help us shape goals and objectives. Obviously, the work that's been done in the past feeds into this as well, the preservation plan, a very in-depth voluminous report that feeds the -- our base of information for what this project looks like. We'll take that, we'll develop a purpose and need based off of that feedback, based off of the goals of HDOT for this project, the goals of the community, and we'll start to look at alternatives, what engineering solutions can be done, sort of analyzing those to get the best value, the best fit, in-depth resource analysis to make sure -- there's often a tradeoff that has to occur when you have conflicting resources so we try to balance that, endangered species occur within this corridor, there's sensitive flora as well, it's a historic district and we have to -- we weave that all together to -- to try to find the best solution, and then we work on the environmental documentation for the clients, the necessary permits, etcetera, and, you know, some of the key considerations that have been identified, but you may have your own key considerations and that's -- that adds to this process, right, 'cause we're looking for that sweet spot between engineering, environmental, and community impacts. Obviously, we have to be prudent with taxpayer dollars; unfortunately, there's -- there's not as much money as need, and so we wanna make sure that that money goes as far as it can, we also wanna make sure that the Hana community, given the number of bridges and the age of infrastructure on that, that they're not in a perpetual state of construction for the next several decades, right, you look at 43 bridges, the youngest being 1946, you know, that's -- that is a lot of work just this stretch of roadway will need, and so we wanna balance that and find that sweet spot. We look at all environmental resources. Here's a handful, obviously, biological, cultural, visual, noise impact, socioeconomic, like I said, there's unique businesses that occur along this corridor, we wanna make sure that we're balancing all of that. Water quality and wetlands. Unfortunately, I'm sure some of that white paint on the picket railings is lead based paint and so we have to manage hazardous materials. There could be asbestos materials within the bridge. Those -- that comes with the territory, right? Air quality. Right-of-way. We understand right-of-way challenges that can exist along the route as well so we look at all of those to see what options we have.

And then following this data-gathering, this scoping process, we go into the field survey where we start to look at environmental field surveys as well as topographical field surveys, so that -- that includes the archaeological and architectural historians, which Ian indicated his involvement, we look at threatened endangered species and sensitive habitats and run the gamut of that as well as beginning to collect the topographical surveys, which as you know there's not a lack of topography on Hana Highway. We take that, we develop those goals and objectives, we develop that purpose and need, and we

start beginning that alternative analysis and all the while we continue to outreach. As part of this project, we've identified numerous public meetings that we wanna have along the way to make sure we're checking in with these communities as things progress, as things develop, we're having that engagement, meeting with Native Hawaiian organizations and other consulting parties, other interested groups, and that's why we're here, right, so this week, we've been having those first public meetings, we'll then start to dive into the surveys and the preliminary concepts, we hope to come back this summer with more details, more data, present that to the public in a second public meeting, continuing that involvement going into the spring of next year, another public meeting, and then a fourth meeting has been slated as well, and I guess fourth week of meetings because, like I said, we've had three meetings with the community this week as well your organization, and others, and then, hopefully, moving forward 2021, to have something that's ready for construction and moving forward.

And so this is -- this is -- this is what you're really about, your input into this project, how you can help shape it, we have setup a project website, this hanabridgeimprovements.com that this presentation is available, materials will be made available, you can also submit comments, the community, anyone can submit comments to this website that they come to us, you can get on our mailers so that anyone can be kept apprised of how the project is moving and -- and really that -- that's -- that's where we're at in a nutshell. So like I said, we have been completing surveys, we do not have an APE right now, we are in the background collection of data and trying to look at the constructability and the logistical challenges that obviously are very important along this route 'cause that affects how these solutions look, staging of materials, how can we deliver equipment within this corridor, the entire route is ten-ton load limited, so getting just concrete or construction equipment to these sites proposes a lot of challenges, and so we have to look at -- at that. Obviously, a lot of people drive this route, not only for tourism, but because they live in these communities and we want to minimize those impacts to these communities so constructability is a huge component and what those traffic impacts, there's delays, how we can manage that so it's as least painful as possible. And then, you know, obviously, contingency planning as well. So without further blustering --

Chair Lay: Commissioners, before we go to questions and comments, we're going to public testimony right now if anyone wishes to testify at this time and step forward, you have three minutes. Seeing no one, public testimony is closed. Commissioners, any questions or comments? Commissioner Skowronski.

Mr. Skowronski: Is it your -- well, let's backtrack. Have you had any communications with the Hana community about your intentions?

Mr. Parker: Yes. On Tuesday, we met with them in the community center and they saw the presentation that you've seen here. We fielded questions for over an hour with them. You know, the primary feedback that we received from them is in context of the corridor, keep it narrow, keep it slow, and try to minimize those construction impacts because they deal with the landslides, they deal with those --

Mr. Skowronski: And your intention on particularly these six bridges is to keep the width of the right-of-way as it presently exist?

Mr. Parker: We do intend to keep it as narrow as possible. The preservation plan called for a uniform 16-foot wide bridge but the -- from the public meetings and others, the -- there was a desire to not restrict the width, so like perfect example is Kailua is a 20-foot wide bridge deck but it does have some very sharp curbs coming into it, and so they were hesitant to narrow it more than it's already, keep it single lane, but don't narrow it more because of the trucks that are already coming through. They pointed to an example of a bridge that was recently constructed in their community that was overly narrowed and it's not being used as intended I believe because of that narrow access.

Mr. Skowronski: But the concept or the point of the bridges primarily being single one-way bridges?

Mr. Parker: Yes.

Mr. Skowronski: Was -- was the community for, against, or did they -- was it adequately explained that the bridges were going to be kept one-way only?

Mr. Parker: Yes.

Mr. Skowronski: And what was their response to that?

Mr. Parker: That was their desire. There was no vocal convert it to a two-lane corridor.

Mr. Skowronski: Okay. Do you -- do you know how many -- has any study been made as to how many vehicles daily would be traversing this belt road?

Mr. Parker: We will be looking at the average daily traffic of residents as well as tourists and keep that into, you know, account. Like I said, some of our other projects around the islands have similar challenges, the Wainiha Stream Bridges are a perfect example, those are single-land bridges on the north shore of Kauai, on Kuhio Highway, that community also wanted to maintain that single-lane bridge and we worked with them on a design solution that would -- would meet the community's needs while still accommodating upgrading to current standards as far as safety in the bridge railings, obviously trucks and

cars are not getting smaller, unfortunately, and so they're heavier and we have to take those new engineering forces into account with it.

Mr. Skowronski: But -- but your meetings with the community, there was no response or there was no questions by the community to widen the bridge's right-of-way?

Mr. Parker: No. But, obviously, you have a voice in this as well and I'm not sure --

Mr. Skowronski: Well let me ask you this is it possible to refurbish the bridges in their historic nature and provide for a two-lane bridge?

Mr. Parker: So we haven't done that detailed engineering analysis, that's part of the investigation that we'll be looking at, that's it -- that is very challenging when you look at the age of these structures especially when you talk about -- if you're talking about widening them to a full two-lane, that would take a lot of band-aides to -- to get that --

Mr. Skowronski: Is it possible?

Mr. Parker: With enough money and engineering, everything's possible, but, you know, we are constrained as well fiscally.

Mr. Skowronski: Well, my -- my point is that the bridges, some of the bridges are over a hundred years old.

Mr. Parker: Yes.

Mr. Skowronski: The traffic to and from Hana is no longer anywhere near the scale of 1914. They're -- having lived in Nahiku and having projects and having to go out and service these projects, the narrowness of the bridges makes the trek longer. If people are working and living in Hana, and they are community back and forth to this -- this side, it's -- it's an increased timeframe for them to get to and from their jobs or their shopping or -- or whatever they're doing, and to say nothing of the drivers for the Maui Electric trucks or the drivers for Morrad or the drivers for the telephone company --

Mr. Parker: Yeah.

Mr. Skowronski: They have to -- they have to service Hana sometimes as early as 5:30, 6:00 in the morning so that they can get out there in a timely fashion and it's very inefficient transportation, it's a very inefficient artery to get from where you live to where you work or vice-versa.

Mr. Parker: Yeah, and not only the narrowness of the corridor, but also the load limitations on the route --

Mr. Skowronski: Absolutely.

Mr. Parker: When they deliver fuel --

Mr. Skowronski: Right.

Mr. Parker: They have to light-load it when they deliver concrete, they don't add the water, it's a dry mix because it can't handle the additional weight of just water in the truck --

Mr. Skowronski: Right.

Mr. Parker: So there's -- they're having to do a lot of additional effort to deliver materials.

Mr. Skowronski: I'm just wondering if -- if the people that this improved artery are servicing are being serviced, they have an opportunity now to access Federal funds to repair, renovate, and upgrade a hundred year old artery, and the idea that they're going to be accessing Federal money to keep the artery a hundred years old by restricting its width, I'm wondering is the -- does the community realize that they're being strangled or that they're being forced into an inefficiency for their commutes and their commercial activities? Has that been broached to them? Do they appreciate that? Do they care about it? Have these questions been raised?

Mr. Parker: So, you know, they -- when we identified some of the design criteria of upgrading it to 40-ton load limits, a TL2 crash tested railing, which is a crash tested railing that can withstand a 35-mile plus impact, some of those design criteria which are Federal requirements for upgrading, you know, they did express hesitation to go -- you know, 40 tons sounds like an exorbitant amount of weight until you start looking at a fuel truck that's trying to deliver fuel to that area or something, but they -- they did want us to see if there was flexibility on some of the standards to make sure we maintain that context of the corridor, we are looking at all options are on the table. Obviously, you know, that preservation plan is a great starting place, but it doesn't have the engineering and all of the investigation that we have bring to the table to make sure geo-technically, seismically, hydraulically, structurally, we are addressing the needs of these bridges because a bridge has a job to do, it's -- they are beautiful to look at, they're beautiful to stop at, but they also have a job to do and that is to transport goods and services and people from one side to other so we have to balance that with their intended purpose.

Chair Lay: And we'll move on to our next Commissioner and we'll come back if you have any more questions. Commissioners, any more questions or comments? Commissioner Greig -- Lee-Greig.

Ms. Lee-Greig: You indicated that you didn't have the APE worked out yet.

Mr. Parker: Correct.

Ms. Lee-Greig: And so are you looking at individual APEs for each bridge area and staging area? Do you have that -- an idea of how you'll be kinda looking at it overall?

Mr. Parker: Yeah, obviously, we do expect APEs that surround the bridge sites, do we need a temporary bypass or not, like how -- those kind of logical aspects so make sure each bridge is captured in its way; obviously, we'll also -- the paved surface of the roadway will be utilized throughout the corridor to access each of these structures, and then we're looking for staging areas, there are very limited staging areas along the route given the terrain and its dense vegetation, but, yes, we -- we wanna make sure that we don't propose something that's not constructible as well so -- and that impacts are assessed.

Ms. Lee-Greig: Do you anticipate being able to develop these APEs and coming back for additional consultation once your APE is developed?

Mr. Parker: Yeah, we'd love to because we also wanna share that APE with the SHPD, make sure that they have an understanding of what we're assessing, where these resource, in-depth resource analysis are going, so yes.

Ms. Lee-Greig: And then do you anticipate doing it kinda one at a time, like a stepped fashion or just bringing it all at once?

Mr. Parker: You're talking about construction or --

Ms. Lee-Greig: Construct -- no, just additional consultation, like looking at your APE and presenting that as one.

Mr. Parker: So this project is being delivered as one project; now, how each bridge is delivered, constructed will be part of our analysis, but, yeah, we will be looking at each bridge as part of this -- a larger project.

Ms. Lee-Greig: And then, sorry, will you -- so we have the APE, initial definition of your APE, and then coming out, and then once the studies are completed and the findings of surveys are completed, is there a possibility to come back, like how many -- you gave your outline --

Mr. Parker: Is that something -- is that something the Commission desires I guess?

Ms. Lee-Greig: Potentially, yeah. Yes.

Mr. Parker: So we, like I said, we do have multiple public meetings scheduled, we want to take of advantage of that this week out here. As great as it is to visit Maui, we're not here being tourists, we're here to work, and so we're trying to maximize that time and meeting with as many communities and as many interested parties as possible, so if that's something the Commission is interested in, that next round of public meetings, we could do the same thing to make sure we schedule time with you.

Ms. Lee-Greig: Okay.

Chair Lay: Commissioners? I have a -- oh, go ahead.

Mr. Bassford: No, by all means.

Chair Lay: Commissioner Bassford, no, go right ahead. I'll be last.

Mr. Bassford: In the preservation plan, restoration and rehabilitation only. No demo. Right?

Mr. Parker: That was -- that is what was talked about at a high level.

Unidentified Speaker: …(inaudible - not speaking into the microphone)…

Mr. Parker: Yeah, so obviously the preservation plan also talked about removing all of the CRM abutments and replacing those with concrete abutments that would then -- that rock was mortared on. You know, we're bringing the engineering to the table to make sure we can preserve what we can and to identify what needs to go as we start assessing character defining features.

Mr. Bassford: Okay, and that's -- that's what my concern is, one of the things that makes that road so unique is the character of each specific bridge, and for me, as someone born here, that -- that makes that drive and all those different architectural styles --

Mr. Parker: Yeah.

Mr. Bassford: And one of things that I've noticed throughout the course of my -- my work is that when old bridges are demoed, sometimes they're rebuilt in the same fashion with modern techniques, sometimes they're not, but one of the things that is -- one of the things

that has really bothered me is the old date stamps and names are virtually erased from history, and a good example is Kalilinui Bridge, I believe that bridge was originally constructed in about 1915 and was reconstructed about 2013, '14, that old stamp was obliterated and now there's a new date there. The bridge was reconstructed in the old character, but the date's gone. So for me, as an individual, I think it's important that if the names and the stamps cannot be cut out and reused because of compression values and stuff like that, I, personally, would like to see those original dates and character defining features reincorporated into the bridge --

Mr. Parker: Okay.

Mr. Bassford: So you would have like say on the makai side the original date of 1908, and then on the mauka side you have the reconstruction date, and specifically say "reconstructed," not constructed.

Mr. Parker: Gotcha.

Mr. Bassford: You know, that's just me, as an individual person.

Mr. Parker: No, it's a good -- and the community also expressed that they wanted those names and dates on there as well, so that's -- that is something we have heard from the community and we've incorporated that in all of the bridges that I've identified, have those name and date stamps because we understand that's important so --

Mr. Bassford: Awesome.

Mr. Parker: Yeah.

Mr. Bassford: Awesome. Thank you.

Mr. Parker: Yeah.

Ms. Albino: My question is along that same line if they're going to rebuild or restore, what are the parameters you have identified in your plan to keep the cultural, traditional spirit of it all because once you take out even a little, a part of the element, you lose the moolelo, you lose that -- the whole story of the place and that place old and has so much? There's no place like it in the world.

Mr. Parker: Yeah.

Ms. Albino: And so we wanna retain as much as possible rather than reconstruct --

Mr. Parker: Yeah.

Ms. Albino: So that's the question I had.

Mr. Paker: No, we agree, and we're not trying to make this a modern highway. We want to keep that character. We don't -- we understand, safety is important, but we don't want to litter it with flashing beacons and reflectors everywhere, so we want to maintain context sensitivity, that's -- that is important to us, and that's -- that's what we do as an agency, and so that -- I think that's why we got involved on this project, frankly, is to make sure that we can work through those challenges and to come up with a good context sensitive solution that -- that meets the engineering needs of today but pays homage to that character.

Ms. Albino: Thank you.

Chair Lay: Commissioner Celiz, you had a question?

Ms. Celiz: I'm just agreeing with --

Chair Lay: Okay.

Ms. Celiz: With everything that's been mentioned so far to maintain the character and kind of -- I think it's great that you're getting input from the community members.

Chair Lay: Commissioner Sablas.

Ms. Sablas: Mahalo for your -- for your excellent presentation. I appreciate the process you're going through and especially going to the community of Maui. My background has been in the visitor industry, and I've been to almost every state promoting the beauty of Maui for visitors to come here, but I've always prided the fact that we have the road to Hana, and the beauty of the road to Hana, to me, was to experience. I mean to go to Hana means you just kinda like slow down. In this world where people are so, you know, hurrying to go here and there, especially if you've been to New York, you know, people don't walk, they run there, it's nice to have a place on earth that actually forces you to slow down and that, to me, is part of the beauty of Hana, I understand what our fellow Commissioner is saying about, you know, the reality of getting things there, but I also really agree with the sentiments of Commissioner Bassford about keeping the integrity. The bridges of Hana has come before the Cultural Resources Commission before when I was on the Commission back then, and I remember one of the things that was said then was that, you know, they were recommending some of the bridges needed to be replaced, and when we had experts from other areas to come, and if I recall correctly, the opinion was that the reason why some of the bridges they're recommending to replace it is

because of the weight and one of the reasons was that because they would just pave on and add more concrete instead of really getting down to the bottom and -- and using that process, and I think now it's been addressed so that you don't keep adding concrete and concrete and become -- you know, add to the weight.

Mr. Parker: Yeah.

Ms. Sablas: And the other thing I remember we talked about was again the uniqueness of each bridge and being careful not to add the modern day, I mean I guess the example I have if you go to Kaupo and the bridge, they have all those modern steel kinda thing, I'm not an engineer, I don't know how to explain it but --

Mr. Parker: Transition rails and guardrails …(inaudible)…

Ms. Sablas: Yeah, it's ugly, you know --

Mr. Parker: Steel.

Ms. Sablas: And just be sensitive that we don't bring that type of correction into that, the Hana Bridges. But, please, I think, you know, listen to the community but I like that you said go -- what, keep it narrow or go -- keep it slow.

Mr. Parker: Yeah.

Ms. Sablas: That's what Hana is all about. I mean that's what makes it unique and I think that certainly is why people go there it's because of -- and if we, you know, I've always said, if we make too fast, then it destroys what Hana is all about. You don't want people rushing to -- to that area. You really want them to go that slow, ten miles an hour, it's good. It's good for everybody to slow down. And again, I just wanted to thank you. This is a long process I can see but let's just do it right, and thank you for keeping the community in mind.

Mr. Parker: Absolutely. I appreciate the comments. We definitely want -- it is a process, and we want to make sure that the solution that is brought forward blends with its environment. You know, unfortunately, bridges don't grow when they get wet and these bridges have been -- they're in a harsh environment, there's some tough engineering challenges, and we can balance that, you know, so when we look at safety features, you know, so a perfect example, the preservation plan talks about the CRM guard walls that tie into those bridge rails, obviously those don't meet current crash requirements, but that rock is still good, you can do a concrete core wall that then is refaced with that, put the name in there, and it carries that character forward and blends with that environment

while still meeting the requirements, so that's just an example, but we're looking at how can we balance the solution.

Chair Lay: How challenging has it been for your Federal guidelines versus the bridges that we have nowadays? You got railing heights, I mean how high is the railing height nowadays for Federal guidelines just --

Mr. Parker: So it varies. Obviously, it would vary depending on if it's a vehicular railing or a pedestrian rated railing, right, so those change the height, but we -- we take that onto consideration when we look at context even if pedestrians are walking across the bridge, there's also, you know, the visitor's expectations, so when they see all the bridges on that route have, you know, like a lower railing, then why would we propose something that's much taller that is not with the expectation that currently exist, so perfect example, Wainiha, those stream bridges up there, I think that community in Hanalei and Haena was very -- wanting in that context of those historic bridges that were lost in the -- to return, and so we proposed some modern railings and -- but that looked just like the historic one, they were structural steel too rather than the two-by-four ones that were constructed on that on that route, but they, aesthetically, looked like those old ones and they were actually a little lower so that that view shed was improved and driver safety was captured, so that's something we haven't identified, but we will be evaluating through this process.

Chair Lay: Okay, so when we go through this whole process again, will you have examples of the different handrails and stuff so the people can actually see instead of having …(inaudible)…

Mr. Parker: Yes, right now it's early. We're here. We're starting.

Chair Lay: Okay.

Mr. Parker: But at -- you're not the only one who's going to want to see that, right? All the community members are going to want to see it and that's where, as we get more details and we start to come up with these alternatives and solutions, we come back and we present those so that we can sit here and we can look at it and digest it.

Chair Lay: Commissioners, anymore comments or questions?

Ms. Albino: I have a question.

Chair Lay: Commissioner Albino.

Ms. Albino: You know the engineering of the past, how have you relate it to present engineering 'cause the engineering of the past allowed the bridges to remain rather intact

even though, you know, some things aren't getting, you know, rotting in the weather and what do you think about the basic engineering of those bridges?

Mr. Parker: Well, I'm going to let maybe Tammy speak, she's -- she's --

Chair Lay: Oh, if you can identify yourself and pass over the mike please.

Ms. Heffron: Hello. My name is Tammy Heffron. I work for HDR Engineering, and I work from Thomas so I work for you, the community, and my background is structural engineering, I've been a bridge engineer and project manager for we'll just say over 20 years, and so the question was the engineering of the past versus the engineering of today and how we design things. I concur. Those bridges were built what I would call very stout, they've lasted a long time and done very well, but as Thomas mentioned, each bridge has, you know, a life cycle, and in that day, bridges were not designed to last more than 50 years, so these bridges have done exceptionally well. Today, we design bridges to the code, it's called the "AASHTO" Code, it's a FHW code, it stands for the …(inaudible)… State Highway Transportation Officials, and it requires a design life of 75 years, and so that's one thing that we definitely consider as we put forth not just our design, but our detailing in such that we want to provide a solution that last at least 75 years; that way, the community is impacted less frequently, and additionally, not just at the end of its life, but throughout its life to minimize the maintenance that they require.

Ms. Albino: So those bridges have lasted for over a hundred years are basically still intact? I mean they've been traveled over, you know --

Ms. Heffron: Yes, they -- they are showing the signs of distress, so every two years, the Federal Highway Administration requires all states to inspect, have a structural engineer come out and inspect the bridges to assess their condition, and so while, in general, they're in very, very good shape, there are signs of patching that has been done in the past to -- to retrofit, to remedy areas of those distress, and as we've looked at these both this week and we were here last summer taking a detailed look at them, there are areas that -- that showed distress; additionally, the load rating is of great concern to the state, the ten-ton load limit is posted out there, you know, we've seen trucks move out there that I would -- I'd be real interested to them on a scale.

Ms. Albino: Thank you.

Chair Lay: Commissioner Sablas.

Mr. Parker: You know, some of the -- some of the distress is also not visible from the roadway surface so, you know, some of these bridges have exposed rebar underneath that's -- that's really rusted and concrete is busting out, there's voiding so when you tap

on it, you hear the hollow sound inside, and at Puohokamoa is scour critical so there's signs of undermining near the abutment and, you know, those concrete rubble masonry abutments do not have rebar backing or any -- so if that material starts to weep out, then you could -- you have trouble, and so, you know, some of it takes a little -- another look to see some of the issues, but that is all part of the engineering analysis.

Ms. Albino: Thank you.

Chair Lay: Commissioner Sablas.

Ms. Sablas: That was an interesting point you brought up, as an engineer, nobody monitors the weight of -- of the trucks that go across the bridges, right? There's no way of monitoring? I mean people can just ignore the -- the ton.

Ms. Heffron: Each state has a different policy. I don't -- no, there's nobody out there with a scale.

Ms. Sablas: And that's -- I don't know.

Ms. Heffron: True.

Ms. Sablas: I just thought about it when you brought it up. That's a major concern. I mean --

Ms. Heffron: That's true.

Ms. Sablas: If the bridges need to be, and then if there's nobody monitoring, is the thought maybe of something that should be looked at.

Ms. Heffron: In general, the bridges are, of yesteryear and of today, are designed with factors of safety, we just don't reveal those to the truck drivers so they can take advantage of that. No, it's -- it's in the code, it's all public record, but, you know, the -- as one of my professors said when I was in school, the bridges are smarter than we are, they find a way to carry loads that are a bit heavier than we've designed for, but, you know, I know on major highways on the Mainland, yes, they have scales, but this is -- this not an interstate.

Ms. Sablas: I have another question for you, Tammy. So in the design of the bridges, who has the final say, the Federal Government or the State, on the final design?

Ms. Heffron: So in developing the design criteria, we start with the Federal and State basics as our starting point. That's where we start. And then as we work into the design

criteria specific for each project, we take in consideration of the context of -- of the area, of the use of the structure, and we, often in situations like this, we will -- we will tweak it. We may modify it. And so that is part of -- of the process. As you go through the environmental process, you're also going through the design process and saying your criteria for which you're going to then move forward and develop the improvements for.

Ms. Sablas: So the answer to my question who has the final say the State or --

Mr. Parker: So it's kinda -- it's kind of a joint decision. We -- we propose those final design standards and our office and the Hawaii DOT signs off on that because we all have to live with those final solutions, and so we have a joint responsibility to sign off.

Ms. Sablas: So where does the County come in?

Mr. Parker: They don't. I mean they do in their voices and all that, but this, you know, DOT owns this route, these are their bridges that obviously the public utilizes, and, you know, at the end of the day, they have to live with and maintain them as well so --

Ms. Heffron: Would an example be helpful? So an example project that I worked on in another state where we started with those Federal criteria, we -- we looked at the hydraulic criteria that wanted to pass the hundred-year event, so every hundred years, the typical hydraulic storm comes through and, you know, they want it to pass under the structure, and so when we looked at that, in this small forest setting, we would have ended up with a viaduct, which was not appropriate for that setting, and so after we did that real conceptual-level preliminary engineering, we took a step back and we said this is not the appropriate solution, and we revised the design criteria such that they were much smaller structures, much more appropriate for the setting, the context.

Mr. Parker: And to let me, I could add to that so, for example, those Wainiha Stream Bridges, "Wainiha" means unfriendly water, and it is a tough watershed up there and, you know, we have standards that we pass certain design flows, just as Tammy indicated, but when we start doing the hydraulic analysis for that watershed, the entire roadway overtops what is called a five-year event, so a very frequent flow versus the hundred-year, which is a very infrequent, hopefully, storm, I know they've had some heavy rain recently, but -- and we don't wanna -- you know, the houses are on stilts in that community but we're not -- we're not intending to build a viaduct to just to meet a standard, we have to balance that with what that current corridor looks like as well as fiscal concerns that are, you know, associated with a project of that nature, and then it's more to maintain, etcetera, so it's a balance.

Chair Lay: Commissioners? Commissioner Skowronski.

Mr. Skowronski: You're -- you're under no requirement to get a County permit or a State permit. Is that correct?

Mr. Parker: So --

Mr. Skowronski: Building permits?

Mr. Parker: So, currently, the Hana -- this Hana Highway project was included in a Governor's exemption for the State 343 process, and that included SMA and conservation district use permits, but we do -- we don't see that as a blank check. So we -- but we are trying to balance and look at the Federal NEPA process and what that entails, obviously, there's the Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, and all of these statutes that we have to -- to satisfy.

Mr. Skowronski: But when it comes time for the final design, all the State and County agencies are advisory, they're not -- they're not -- there's no requirement for any State or County organization for approval, it's just advisory input --

Mr. Parker: Yes.

Mr. Skowronski: Whatever you come up with is what the Feds going to do and that's it. Is that legally correct?

Mr. Parker: Yeah, it doesn't define the success of this project though.

Chair Lay: Commissioners, any more questions or comments? So, Annalise, at this point, what are we supposed to -- what is the agenda on this as far as comments or --

Ms. Kehler: Chair, so we're just offering comments today, and so I've been kind of recording what I've been hearing and I can read those back to you.

Chair Lay: Yes, please.

Ms. Kehler: Okay. So I heard one concern about making sure that the community in Hana feels comfortable with maintaining one-way roads or one-way bridges, and then I heard a request for the Cultural Resources Commission to be consulted on the area of potential effects for the bridges as well as surveys, cultural surveys, architectural surveys, and then potentially for design, the design phase as well, and then there was quite a few comments about the character of the bridges and that each bridge is unique and to try to really make sure that whatever solutions happen, take each bridge's uniqueness into consideration. There was a comment about making sure that as much -- whatever is possible to retain is retained and the reason being that, you know, there's moolelo or

history and stories associated with each one of these places and the more that you change them, the less of that moolelo remains. There was a comment about the Hana Road, part of the beauty is that it's slow going and that the bridges help keep that slow pace. And then, other than that, the rest of them were questions that were answered, so those were the comments that I heard.

Chair Lay: Anybody wanna add anything else? I would like to. If we can get a photo of your -- how you have each bridge individualized or you have your historical look as it is right now to what you're going to do, that would be nice too. The changes that were made on your completed project that way we have something to compare with.

Mr. Parker: That'll be great. Like simulations or something like that.

Chair Lay: Yeah.

Mr. Parker: And we -- we did that on the Wainiha Stream Bridge project, just kinda show what it would like in that -- that context, so a before and after. That's always --

Chair Lay: That'll help a lot.

Mr. Parker: Pictures are worth a thousand words, right?

Chair Lay: And again, the material, if we can see the material of the, you know, of what you're going to be doing on your bridge, your railings, and that sort of thing so --

Mr. Parker: Yep.

Chair Lay: Again, like a hands-on kinda thing --

Mr. Parker: Yep.

Chair Lay: Not just a picture.

Mr. Parker: Absolutely.

Chair Lay: Thank you.

Ms. Albino: I think that's important because, like you said earlier, we can't see what's in the structure, from outside it may look good, I'm thinking about something that happened on Molokai where everything looked good but the interior structure did not have the standard we were hoping for, not that you …(inaudible)… do that, just for our -- our seeing and our understanding and being able to move forward with the plan. It's a big plan. It's

a beautiful plan. Thank you for that comment about you're not going to see Hana if you whiz by. You have to take your time.

Mr. Parker: Yeah.

Ms. Albino: We have a sign on Molokai, it says, when you're coming out of the airport, "Slow Down. This is Molokai." So, you know, you don't wanna whiz through. Thank you.

Chair Lay: Appreciate the history too. Thanks. It was really nice to read it.

Mr. Parker: Mahalo.

Ms. Sablas: Thank you very much.

Chair Lay: That's all everyone? Thank you very much. Next.

Ms. Sablas: Enjoy Maui.

Chair Lay: Moving on. Communications, no. 2:

Chair Lay read the following agenda item description into the record:

2. Department of Public Works, Engineering Division inviting the Cultural Resources Commission to participate in National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 consultation for the proposed replacement of Kahana Nui Bridge, located at Lower Honoapiilani Road and Kahana Nui Stream, TMK (2) 4-3-005:029 por., 083 por.; (2) 4-3-010:999 por.; (2) 4-3-019:028 por., 049 por.

The Commission may advise the Department of Public Works, Engineering Division in carrying out its historic preservation responsibilities, pursuant to Subsection 2.88.060.A, Maui County Code

Chair Lay: Annalise.

Ms. Kehler: Thank you, Chair. I'm just going to -- I am going to give you kind of like an overview of -- of the project and a little bit of background research that I did on the area, so let me just load that presentation.

Okay, so in your -- in your mailout packets, there's a -- there's an invitation letter to the Cultural Resources Commission from the Department of Public Works to participate in

the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Consultation Process, and so -- and I'll explain to you in a second what the Section 106 Consultation Process is, but before I get into that, I'll just kinda give you a little overview of where the project is.

So it's -- it involves the replacement of Kahana Nui Bridge, and it's in Kahana, and that's what it looks like from an oblique view. It's kind of obscured by vegetation. So the Department, or, I'm sorry, the Department of Public Works has identified the area of potential effect for this project, and so the area of potential effect is a technical term that comes from Federal law, and it -- for our purposes today, you can think of it as like the project area. So Public Works has identified the area of potential effect, as shown on this map, so that includes Lower Honoapiilani Road, between Hua Nui Place and Omaikai Place, and that area is approximately .73 acres, it includes both the length and width of Lower Honoapiilani Road, which is approximately .8 miles long and 50 feet wide, and I'll talk a little bit more about the area of potential effect in a second.

So just to kinda summarize what exactly is being proposed, okay, so the bridge replacement project involves road improvements and utility relocation on Lower Honoapiilani Road, from Hua Nui Place to Omaikai Place. Okay, so when they're replacing the bridge, they're going to be widening it, they're also going to be lengthening the span, and then moving the water and sewer lines to the outside of the newer wider bridge.

Okay, so I'm going to talk a little bit about the legal framework for today's discussion. So the Commission is being asked to -- if they would like to participate under the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, so, okay, so that's codified in the Code of Federal Regulations as 36 CFR 800, and Federal undertakings trigger this law, so an undertaking can include projects that use Federal money, projects on Federal land, or projects that are proposed by a Federal agency, okay, and so what this law does is it requires Federal agencies or their designees, in this case the Department of Public Works is the Federal agency's designee, so it requires the Federal agency or their designee to consider how the projects they carry out approve or fund might affect historic properties. So it encourages but doesn't require preservation, and there's a number of other things that this law requires Federal agencies to do, and at each step of the way, they're required to consult with Native Hawaiian organizations, local governments, and interested parties, so consultation is a key component of this law, and that's why it's called the "Section 106 Consultation Process," and so the Federal Highway Administration is providing the funding for this project, and as I stated before, they have officially designated Department of Public Works and the State Department of Transportation to conduct the Section 106 Consultation Process for this project. And then this -- the Cultural Resources Commission can participate in this conversation because you're authorized to in the County Code, so subsection 2.88.060A authorizes you to advise Federal, State, and County governments

in carrying out their historic preservation responsibilities, so that's just to give you guys some bearings on how you're allowed to participate in this.

Okay, so I -- I thought that if the Commission wanted to provide comments, it would be helpful to do a little bit of research, historical background for you guys, so the map that's up there now, it's from 1885, and that little yellow circle on the coast, that's the approximate location of the Kahana Nui Bridge, and so this map shows that the project area falls within Land Grant No. 1166. And so up on the screen now, that's a -- is a copy of Land Grant No. 1166 and it was to D. Baldwin, J.F. Pogue, and S.E. Bishop, and that was executed in 1853. So this is another map showing the project area in relation to Land Grant No. 1166. The Land Grant is that large yellow shaded area. So near the project area, there are several Land Commission Awards within the larger Land Grant, and those Land Commission Awards are shown in orange, so this map is actually not totally accurate, it's missing a few Land Commission Awards that are closer to the project area, and then up on the map, I've included the names of several of the awardees. That's just to give you an idea of what was happening around there at the time of the Mahele. So this is a map from 1929, I think it's a Pioneer Mill map, and it's just to show you kind of the changes that occurred in the area during the plantation period, there's railroad tracks, you can see Puukolii Camp to the south, so just -- just to, you know, show you differences in the map between 1885 and 1929. And then the map that's up there now, this is a United States Geological Survey Quad Map, it's from 1956, it shows the approximate location of Kahana Nui Bridge. This, I put this map up here just to kinda show you the names of streams and gulches that feed into the Kahana Nui Stream, which is the stream that the bridge crosses over. It's also interesting to note like how the names of geographical locations have changed or evolved since the 1885 map, so, particularly, the names of the points in this area have evolved and changed quite a bit from the 1885 map and the 1956 map.

Okay, so there was an archaeological survey, inventory survey done and it encompassed the current project area, that was done in 1999 by Chaminade Researches and it identified three previously unrecorded sites, so there was one pre-contact site, and two post-contact sites. So this is a map showing, you know, the survey area, the previous survey work, that's that thick blue line, that's the approximate location that the previous survey encompassed, and then the orange arrow shows the approximate location of the bridge, and then the three sites that were found during this survey and how they relate to the -- the bridge location. So the first site that was found is Site No. 4797, it's a pre-contact habitation site. There's three features associated with them so -- with this site, feature 2.1 is a basin-shaped pit with traces of charcoal. Feature 2.2 is a basin-shaped pit with fire-cracked rocks, scatter shellfish remains, and charcoal, and the archaeologist interpreted that as a fire pit. And then Feature 2.5 is a basin-shaped pit with scattered flex of charcoal and a fire-cracked rock, and the archaeologist interpreted that as a refuse pit. And so, you know, the approximate location of this habitation site is near the Kaopala

Gulch culvert and crossing, and there was testing done on a charcoal sample from this site and it provided a date range of 1420 to 1660, and the archaeologist assessed this site significance as being significant under Criteria A, which is association with important events, Criteria C, which is design, and then Criteria D, which is ability or importance or ability to yield important information, and then that archaeological inventory survey recommended monitoring as mitigation.

So these are just photos again of, they're not very good quality, but that's from the AIS of Site 4797. Okay, so this second site is 4798. It's a -- the archaeologist is calling these retaining walls and shoulder walls, and he attributes them to part -- to being part of the old Lower Honoapiilani Road, and so the retaining wall is roughly constructed of subangular basalt boulders, and then the shoulder wall is well constructed of subangular basalt cobbles, and he's giving them a date of 1940s and assesses them as not significant or having any value. The third site is another retaining wall that the archaeologist attributes to being part of old Lower Honoapiilani Road, its well-constructed of subangular basalt boulders, again, a date of 1940s was given to this feature or site, and then it was assessed as not significant. And so SHPD, the State Historic Preservation Division issued a letter back in 2015, they didn't really comment on that archaeological inventory survey, they just kinda said it may or may not be adequate for the current project, there was some other stuff that needed to happen first, like they needed to identify their area of potential effect so that's why they didn't get into the adequacy of the archaeological inventory survey, and then architectural resources, the State Historic Bridge Inventory and Evaluation, which was done by the State Department of Transportation, identified the Kahana Nui Bridge. They said -- they attributed its construction date to 1964, it's identified as a concrete T-beam bridge and then it has a solid concrete parapet with cap, and they say it's an exception 1960s concrete bridge because of its uncommon use of solid parapet wall with masonry rubble concrete abutments used during this period, and they said it was eligible for the National Register under Criterion C. This inventory also acknowledged that the bridge is slated for replacement but it did not get into what type of mitigation would be appropriate for its loss. So that's -- that's a -- those are photos of the bridge that's being proposed for replacement.

So now I'm going to summarize what was being requested of you by the Department of Public Works in this letter. So what they're asking you is, one, do you wanna participate in the Section 106 Consultation Process for this project? Two, do you have any comments on the area of potential effect? Three, do you know of any cultural or historic sites in the area of potential effect or nearby? And, four, do you know anyone with cultural ties to the project area? So I'll just say that the benefits of participating in consultation is that the Commission could help resolve potential adverse effects. And then on the area of potential effect, the State Historic Preservation Division did issue a letter concurring with their area of potential effect, but I do -- I am curious about the area below the bridge where ground disturbances might happen, I didn't see that, so that's a question that I have

that I need to ask the State Historic Preservation Division about because I didn't see that lower area incorporated in the area of potential effect. And then, you know, basically I kind of like answered some of these questions, but I don't want to -- I'm not going to like give you guys answers, so I'll let you guys discuss. I'll put those points up that the -- that the Department of Public Works wants information on and I'll let you guys discuss.

Chair Lay: Commissioners, if we can, let's take a ten-minute break and come right back in ten minutes if that's alright with everyone. We've been going at for an hour-and-a-half. So reconvene at 12:35. Short recess.

(A recess was called at approximately 12:27 p.m., and the meeting reconvened at approximately 12:35 p.m.)

Chair Lay: Planning Commission -- Cultural Resources Commission is now back into order, and, Commissioners, if you guys have any questions or comments on any of the -- anything that Annalise brought before us, now is the time. Commissioner Bassford.

Mr. Bassford: Number one, yes. Number two, yes. Number three, yes. And number four, yes.

Ms. Kehler: Okay. So discussion on items three through -- or two, three, and four, I guess. Do we have specific concerns or comments on the area of potential effect that has been identified in your letter? So, for reference, if you go to the letter from the Department of Public Works, the area of potential effect is identified on -- beginning at the bottom of page 2, so if anybody has any comments about -- specific comments about the APE, please let me know.

Chair Lay: Commissioner --

Mr. Skowronski: How close is the bridge to the shoreline?

Ms. Kehler: Let me go back to the -- I'm sorry. There's like a million slides. Okay so that circle there is the bridge in relation to the shoreline.

Mr. Skowronski: Is it presently in the shoreline setback?

Ms. Kehler: That I am not sure of, but that can be a question that we send to -- that we send to the Department of Public Works as --

Mr. Skowronski: The Corps of Engineers is going to be forthcoming with a new hundred-year flood plan for a tsunami. Do we know if the bridge is going to be within that setback?

Ms. Kehler: I am not sure. I'll note that though.

Mr. Skowronski: Also, another comment, can you back to the overview of the map that shows the relationship of the bridge to the auwai, so the bridge is at the confluence of one, two, three, four -- four auwai, right? If you go mauka, there's one, two, three, four drainage areas that are all coming together and spilling into the ocean underneath that bridge. Is that an accurate interpretation of that map?

Ms. Kehler: Yeah, so the top two tributaries that go -- those are streams, and then the bottom two, those are gulches. So you have - let's see - this is the 1956 map -- oh wait.

Mr. Skowronski: Right there.

Ms. Kehler: Yeah, so it's the Malipai and Kahana Streams, and then the Pulepule Gulch and Kahanaiki Gulch feed into the Kahana Nui Stream.

Mr. Skowronski: So it's going -- it has the potential of handling a lot of water?

Ms. Kehler: I would say that's probably safe to assume during the winter.

Mr. Bassford: Are they annual or perennial?

Ms. Kehler: That's a good question.

Chair Lay: So from 29 feet to 40 feet, the width, huh, the bridge?

Mr. Bassford: Can you -- can you go back to the aerial photo that you have? That one works. I have an issue with the area of potential effect because they're listing it as a corridor, that's a residential neighborhood that I don't see any place where they can do any type of material laydown or storage or anything like that, so that's something that needs to be addressed I believe.

Ms. Kehler: So we do see any evidence of a staging area?

Mr. Bassford: No I don't.

Chair Lay: And the reason for widening it from 41 to -- oh, from 29 to 41 feet 4 inches, so is that because of sidewalks or how is that going to connect into the existing road?

Ms. Kehler: Yeah, I believe I read that they're widening it so that they can accommodate a pedestrian --

Chair Lay: Walkway.

Ms. Kehler: Something.

Ms. Sablas: Yeah.

Ms. Kehler: Not necessarily a sidewalk, but like a lane for them to walk on.

Chair Lay: So both sides, huh? Yeah. Commissioner Sablas.

Ms. Sablas: I'm very, very familiar with the area. My ohana lives there. I can see their home. From 1943 to 1955, our home was a -- next to the Kahana Nui Stream. I played in that stream as a youngster. So I -- most of my family are scattered in that Kahana Bay. So interesting, Kahana Nui, when the bridge was small, it could be the interpretation because of all the water that comes through, so, historically, again, you know, I'm -- I have ohana from there, I am not aware myself of anything significant, so I was interested in the archaeological survey that, you know, was -- that you presented there. The recent flooding, was it part of that bridge that they had? I mean I remember my family, the ohana, they couldn't go. The road was all flooded. Was it because of all that -- remember, they had it on the news? It came on -- on just recent. Was it from that bridge?

Ms. Kehler: To be honest with you, I am not sure. I would have to look into that.

Ms. Sablas: It was, you know, with all that storm I think, you know, that they had it on the news on Oahu and Kahana, and I know 'cause my family lives there and the roads were all flooded, I just not -- I would imagine that it's because of that bridge, so I think, you know, consideration, I think Commissioner said about all the water coming in, it's good that it's going to be improved. Unlike Hana, I have no problem with that bridge being widening, you know, being -- because it is a -- a pretty active road there so -- but I mean if you need it, you know, I do know contacts, I mean I don't have it available, because I grew up in that area, you know. I'm going to reach out to -- to people I know who's from there, longtime residents if they have any concern about it, and I'd be happy to send it to you, Annalise.

Ms. Kehler: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Albino: Is this a two-lane bridge or just a one-lane bridge?

Ms. Sablas: It's a narrow bridge. I don't --

Ms. Albino: One-lane.

Ms. Sablas: I don't think it's two-lane 'cause I kinda remember you have to stop and then somebody come, but it's not, you know, it's not a really wide bridge. That's why the name "nui" kinda threw me off.

Ms. Albino: Thank you …(inaudible)…

Chair Lay: Commissioners, anymore comments or concerns? Commissioner Lee-Greig.

Ms. Lee-Greig: So just a little bit about this area at the time of the Mahele, so the land use, the -- just going back through those records of the Mahele Aina and the land use in this area was shoreline, so pa hale, and then the larger Land Commission Award that you showed that comes -- that's south, it kinda has like a -- anyway, that's kula and pa hale.

Ms. Kehler: This one? Is this the map?

Ms. Lee-Greig: Yeah. Yeah, so there's things on the shoreline that are missing from that, that's the Kipuka one, yeah, so there's Land Commission Awards that are missing on the shoreline in that map, so those are house sites, kula, so it could be anything from pasture to dry land agriculture, and then a -- I think there was one more claim for kula uala, so sweet potato in that area. The moolelo for this area is heavy with lawaia traditions and might be reflected in the archaeology so a lot -- some of those fire pits possible imu feature maybe might relate to that -- that type of land use, so looking at the extent of the APE consideration of utility, waterlines, and excavation associated with that, those are the traditional land uses that come to mind with regard to pre-contact sites that might be encountered as well as pa hale, so there's a lot of -- there are house sites and we know that our people buried in -- in and around our homes from time to time, so that's also a -- a consideration as well.

Chair Lay: Commissioners, anymore concerns?

Mr. Bassford: The construction style, again, this is like a mini version of the prior, the construction style I think is important. The issue with the sidewalk, I don't believe there is a sidewalk going along that portion of this lower road.

Chair Lay: No.

Mr. Bassford: No? So they're going to be building a sidewalk that goes on the bridge and then ends?

Chair Lay: Yeah.

Mr. Bassford: If they are going to be having to move the sewer and water utilities that are under the road to the outside of the bridge, would it be possible to build a cantilever or something to maintain the architectural style but to allow a safe passage for pedestrians spanning over the gulch, but again, if there's no sidewalk there it ties into, then what's the point of putting a sidewalk in? But that also might help force the hand to put a sidewalk in. Does that make any sense?

Chair Lay: Commissioners, any more comments or anything else that you'd like to add to this? Oh and, Annalise, if you could run through what we've got so far?

Ms. Kehler: So, essentially, the answer to all four of the Department of Public Works' questions is yes, and then with respect to the area of potential effect, there's concern there's no provision for staging activities or staging area. Where is that? And then, again, as it relates to the area of potential effect, the pre-contact land uses in the shoreline area might help give -- would give clues about the types of sites that might be encountered during construction. And - let's see - the APE -- okay, and then the -- as far as there was a question from Public Works about people with ties to project area, Commissioner Sablas said that she lived in -- right next to Kahana Nui Stream as a child and that she can provide names of folks in the area. And then we got a few other comments and questions that aren't necessarily related to this but we'll send to Public Works, and that is is the project in the shoreline setback; how does it relate to the new I believe the terminology was hundred-year flood plain; are the streams annual or perennial. And then that it seems strange to be providing a pedestrian walkway when there aren't any sidewalks in the area, so you're accommodating width for pedestrians when the rest of the roadway doesn't have anything for pedestrians. And then the construction style for the new bridge should be the same. And what else did I miss?

Chair Lay: Emma Sharpe lived down the road, right? Yeah, and my parents actually grew up -- my mom grew up right next to you.

Ms. Sablas: Yup.

Chair Lay: Right down the road. Small world

Ms. Sablas: Yup, I remember …(inaudible)… very well.

Chair Lay: If we got nothing else to add anyone?

Ms. Albino: Was there a study done, a cultural study done about -- concerning this as you mentioned? Is there any moolelo regarding the places that you mentioned? Was there, you know, historically, has there been any moolelo preserved regarding the places you mentioned?

Ms. Lee-Greig: I don't know for this project, but for other -- other studies, yeah.

Ms. Albino: There is? Okay. That should be considered. The more moolelo we have going back will help us determine how we use the -- the place. Burials. Especially about burials.

Mr. Skowronski: Is this project a Federal project?

Ms. Kehler: It is using Federal funding.

Mr. Skowronski: Using Federal funds.

Ms. Kehler: It's a County project.

Mr. Skowronski: It's a County project so it'll need a building permit.

Ms. Kehler: Yeah, it'll need all that County stuff, an SMA, a special management --

Mr. Skowronski: And it'll have to go through an SMA?

Ms. Kehler: Yeah.

Chair Lay: I thought it went through the Planning Commission already.

Ms. Kehler: It did, and I'm a little unsure about where it is with respect to County entitlements. Okay, so the other comment that we have is, and this ties into the previous land uses, is the moolelo of the area 'cause, again, that will help give clues about types of sites that could be encountered along this project area. And then I -- I read the cultural impact assessment for Pulelehua and it had a good deal of research. It was really great. And so that was -- that supplemented what I read in the -- the archaeological inventory survey prepared for this corridor here.

Chair Lay: Okay, that's all for that. Moving on to Unfinished Business:

Chair Lay read the follow agenda item description into the record:

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Discussion on effort to update the Cultural Resources Management Plan for Maui County from 1984 (Discussion began at the September 6, 2018 meeting) (A. Kehler)

The Commission may discuss the effort to update the Plan pursuant to Subsection 2.88.060.A, Maui County Code

Chair Lay: Annalise.

Ms. Kehler: Okay, so this is just like a -- a really brief two-second update. So the -- when we had the workshop on Molokai, that community decided to sort of form like a committee to decide what type of information they wanted to share with the consultant, and then the consultant will incorporate that information into the existing conditions report, so that committee met once at the end of February and they're meeting one more time, and then they should be ready to share their findings with myself and the -- the consultant by the end of March, and then we'll look to get the existing conditions report out maybe in May. And that's it.

F. NEXT MEETING DATE: April 4, 2019

G. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Lay: Anyone else anything else? And again, thank you, Lori, and thank you, Frank. You're a big asset for us. We're going to have to find at least ten guys to try and replace you guys, just to let you know. They're still looking from what I heard. Cultural Resources Commission is now closed. See you guys next month.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:55 p.m.

Submitted by,

SUZETTE ESMERALDA
Secretary to Boards & Commissions II

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE:

Present:
Ivan Lay, Chairperson
Louella Albino
Ian Bassford
Yvette Celiz
Tanya Lee-Greig
Michael Kaleo Ropa
Lori Sablas
Frank Skowronski

Others:

Jennifer Maydan, Planner VI, Long-Range Division, Dept. of Planning
Annalise Kehler, Cultural Resources Planner, Long-Range Division, Dept. of Planning
Mimi Desjardins, Deputy Corporation Counsel, Dept. of the Corporation Counsel
Suzette Esmeralda, Secretary to Boards & Commissions II, Current Div., Dept. of Planning