

## Meeting Summary

---

### HART/Kāko‘o Monthly Meeting

---

*Date and Time:* **April 24, 2014, 10:00 a.m.**

*Location:* **Ali‘i Place, 1099 Alakea Street, Honolulu, HI 96813**

---

The following materials are attached to these minutes:

- Appendix A Agenda
- Appendix B Draft Treatment Plan for Cultural and Historic Resources at Aloha Stadium Station (dated April 23, 2014)

#### Meeting Purpose

The meeting was facilitated by Dawn Chang. The purpose of this meeting was to gather feedback from consulting parties (CPs) on the Draft Treatment Plan for Cultural and Historic Resources at Aloha Stadium Station. The treatment plan was distributed to everyone today so the meeting was intended as a walk-through of the document.

#### Background (Paul Leursen and Stanley Solamillo)

This is the first treatment plan from HART and we wanted to walk through it and have everyone look at it. The meeting was turned over to Paul and Stanley to provide an overview of the plan.

The treatment plan was in response to Historic Hawaii Foundation’s (HHF) recommendations and questions about the Aloha Stadium and the request to provide a treatment plan. Areas addressed in the treatment plan are based on summaries of HART/Kāko‘o Meetings held on March 13, 19 and 27 include consulting party comments on measures to minimize and mitigate effects at Aloha Stadium Station. For reference, these meeting summaries are included as Attachments 2f, 2g and 2h of the Draft Treatment Plan. This plan was created in close coordination with FTA and SHPD.

The treatment plan is provided for in the Programmatic Agreement (PA) when the station is adjacent to a historic property of district. The treatment plan draws heavily on language from the PA and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and addresses effects to setting, feeling and association to cultural and historic resources at Aloha Stadium Station.

Question: Before we talk about treatment plan specifics, are we planning to cover the other issues we discussed at the last meeting? This included design alternatives. We had asked if HART was only looking at mitigation or are they also looking at design changes. Our concerns related to footprint of the station, pedestrian circulation. HHF submitted an April 2 follow up email with design recommendations.

*Let’s hold on this until the presentation since these issues may come up as we review the treatment plan. If these issues are not addressed we will go back to the treatment plan and address those issues.*

The overview continued with a summary of the sections in the plan. The treatment plan follows other standards for treatment plans and used previous plans as examples.

The treatment plan doesn’t address off-site design impacts that aren’t within HART’s jurisdiction including pedestrian movement and traffic circulation to and from the station. However, HART

will facilitate coordination meetings with relevant and appropriate agencies with regards to off-site improvements.

Chapter 1 is the introduction and is self-explanatory. It outlines why the treatment plan is being done and the purpose of the document.

Chapter 2 provides the regulatory context including an overview of Section 106 compliance, an overview of the PA, agency roles and responsibilities and the requirement of consultations with the CPs.

Chapter 3 goes into more specifics to the Aloha Stadium and the historic sites at Pearl Harbor affected, and addresses historical and cultural resources. This section draws heavily on the language in the AIS. Section 3.6 is a summary of Consulting Party comments.

Chapter 4 are the measures to mitigate concerns about massing and concerns about how Pearl Harbor is impacted. We also discuss the short term next steps.

Chapter 5 summarizes other steps that could be taken. For example off-site pedestrian circulation. Some of these alternatives end up on properties that are not in HART's control.

- We realize that the CPs haven't had the opportunity to read the plan entirely. Our focus is on Chapter 4. There will be time for comments, we need written comments by May 9. By May 15 there will be a revised draft and a continued request for additional input until May 22 for final comments. On May 29 we will issue a final treatment plan.

Today we will walk through this for discussion purposes. Today we wanted to get comments from you and we will be in listening mode and get comments on the treatment plan. We want to walk through the mitigation measures and get comments.

- Because the PA discussed the role of FTA, are there any additional comments? No, but today we will be in listening mode and get comments and suggestions on the mitigation measures proposed.
- Kāko'o, Paul Cleghorn has been in several meetings with HART personnel and comments have been submitted. The Kāko'o went through several drafts. As part of the team, there are two architectural historians and we have gotten comments from both of them, too. We have covered all the bases we could.

We are suggesting that Paul walk us through Chapter 4. The measures were specifically tied to specific comments related to the design. This treatment plan is only in respect to the onsite design of the Aloha Stadium Station, not the offsite issue raised in previous meetings. HART would coordinate and facilitate discussion among other parties to talk about off-site issues including pedestrian flow and traffic.

Question: Unless I am missing something, I don't see anything different than what was presented at the last meeting. Am I missing something, or is there something new in this plan than what was presented at the last meeting by HART?

- *If the question is related to moving the station, it's not being moved.*
- *If the question relates to size, it is the same size. That has not changed.*
- *Table 3.5.1. show the previous attempts made to address size and location*
- *The treatment plan is an attempt to document what has been done to avoid and minimize during the EIS process.*

Question: The CPs are focused on the project post execution in the PA and to the comments made in the last six months. Has anything been done in the last six months that related to comments raised regarding our review of the design?

Comment: It seems that the landscape plan has changed. The color palette for Aloha Stadium has changed. The signed and content has been changed. I'm a little confused on the comments that nothing has changed. I see changes.

- *Attachment 5 addresses some of the changes being made. Also check on page 19.*
- *Attachment 5 covers landscaping context.*
- *We cannot set back the station. Kamehameha Highway is proposed for additional landscaping with plant materials that buffer and be more prominent that what was originally planned.*
- *Makai view from Halawa would incorporate silver trumpet trees and denser spacing.*
- *Large trees, not indigenous, are being selected because of their foliage and the conditions of the area.*
- *Indigenous plants will be used as lower growing materials.*
- *In the planters we will be using Native Hawaiian indigenous plants and shrubs.*

Question: I am assuming these plants are drought tolerant? It is very hot here. Akia was prominent here.

- *There are wet and dry plants.*
- *Travelers palms are being used because they are narrow. The planting area is limited.*

Comment: Our conversation is lovely today. I find myself sitting here and when I look at the report, I can't complain about the report. It stands to reason that some will not like the degree or the extent of the changes made.

When I think about mitigation, my comment is that this is about mitigating a new comer's footprint to Hawai'i. I don't know if FTA can imagine what it is like to sit at this table and have to rely on the integrity of this team to bring forward the story of the native of this land. These plans are the physical finishing touches on a manmade structure. Manmade structures in different parts of the world have different impacts on the land. This does not mitigate the impact of man on man. There is nothing to mitigate the displacement of a culture. Now we have to read about it.

As the chair of the burial council it is my responsibility to speak on behalf of the kūpuna. Where did the Hawaiians go? Look at the plants. They are what Hawaiian's used but not necessarily use today. There are some things I will use. Nothing wrong with the plants.

The presence of our people is being relegated to stamps on the columns. We are being relegated to signs. These are token. Am I displeased on how the project is progressing? No. We are mitigating what we cannot do too much about. This does not change the health of the Hawaiian community, make it more vibrant.

We are spending a lot of time to address small things. It seems that lots of energy and focus is being put into a station. Pearl Harbor, fine and dandy, but what happened to Pu'uloa, the ice box of my people. Now we have to read about it. I am thankful that Hawaiian language is front and center. We can always argue about the design. This puts Hawaiians on a 2 and 3 dimensional plane. Who we are and who we were. What we do versus what we did.

I don't know if I have too much sympathy for people's loss of views. What about the loss of my people? Loss of aesthetics or the loss of my culture? The structure that my people built did not have this impact on the land, it was more harmonious. Why is it that the story of the Hawaiian people is relegated to the way it is.

This is a structure coming up that will not be reflective of Hawaiian composition and it is obviously a foreign building. We don't need to spend too much time mitigating what is not being discussed.

I like the work that I have seen. Thank you for presenting this information. Just the fact that this is coming up says a lot.

- *We have an opportunity to try with a few methods, not a prominent as they need to be or we would like them to be with a technology that is not designed to do that. To use the language and tell the stories as best we can. This is not as prominent as we would like it to be. We are clumsy. We are trying to tell a story on a transit platform. Not the best place but we are trying our best. This is a transportation project, not a museum or cultural center.*

Thank you. They see this as a people mover and do not expect to see the depth and breadth of content. Everybody does not agree on attempting a different level of value. I am not trying to diminish the level of concern people have. The Hawaiian community is not gone from the face of the earth and I will look to this project that will take every opportunity with this project uplift, enhance, promote, promulgate and empower the native story. This is about the presence of the ancestors of this land.

- *Are there other comments?*

Comment: Regarding landscaping. This project has been planned for the long haul. We cannot plan it only to look nice when it opens but need to plan it to be sustainable. Planting should be xeriscape. Use plants that are native to the area and will thrive in that environment. Review the plants being considered and look for plants that grew in that area and they will thrive.

- *This is an excellent suggestion and will be looked at.*
- *There is a proposed landscaping plan included in the instructions to the contractor.*
- *Ultimately any decisions we make today will be incorporated to the contract.*
- *Unless there are some technical reasons that we are not aware of in this room, we can use what we decide in this room.*

Question: The proposed mitigation is superficial and shallow. In our previous meetings there have been concerns about design and placement options. We were told that HART would respond to those concerns. How is the team addressing the proposed changes to setback, massing, scale, circulation and design of the actual structure?

- *You are right. We put these into the "parking lot" and need to address these.*

These comments were put into writing in April but these were discussed a month ago in the last consultation meeting.

- *It is important to note that from a technological, circulation, and pedestrian requirements, bus circulation and use standpoint, everything has been minimized. We have taken them to the bare minimum. We have cut canopies back, reduced*

- stairs to their narrowest useable widths. The architecture and technology requirements that are needed to provide a transportation system at this site cannot be reduced any further. All we are left with are the things we are talking about today.*
- *The station design cannot be changed. The amount of time spent to design what we have has been tremendous and everything has been done to address the issues raised. We have, over a period of time, made an effort to value engineer, optimize, reduce and take out things, even prior to the PA to bring this station to the smallest possible footprint. Chapter 4 discussed those mitigation measures that can be done. Nothing more can be done to the physical design of the station or its location.*

Comments: You aren't saying you can't, you're saying you won't. Be honest. You are foreclosing alternatives. You have a forgone conclusion that you are not going to change anything meaningful.

- *We have certain components that we have to assemble in a certain way. We can make more changes but these would be minimal. We are at the point to where we have assembled the components in the most efficient way. Moving the station is not on the table.*

FTA Comments: we are here to identify and respond to impacts. I believe that is what the treatment plan is doing. It has identified impact and proposed responses to them. This is not an effort to get a group together and come up with a consensus design that makes everyone happy. We need to keep anchored in Section 106 and focus on the impacts and once we have an agreed on impact, which the treatment plan states are general impacts and the treatment plan as it is drafted proposes responses to the impact. We don't have a wide range of solutions because we believe that treatment plan identified and addresses the impacts. Given the impacts we have identified, does the treatment plan look at these impacts and identified solutions to these impacts.

Comments: The impacts are within the context of feeling, setting and association. One of the problems we have is that the station is right up against Kamehameha Highway. It needs to be further back. That's why these questions are being asked. They do relate to impact.

- *We have a whole set of new problems if that happens. We have an agreement with the Stadium Authority and they want to preserve their parking.*
- *If we move, we will have an impact on iwi kūpuna and other sub-surface cultural resources. The existing site has been tested for these. A change would need a supplemental AIS. We open up another set of potential problems.*
- *Design changes would make changes in the guideway moving the station could cause more problems than solving.*

Comments: This is the first time that anyone in the HART team has talked about the problems if the station is moved.

Comments: Moving the station over the highway would create more parking and would reduce the impact on the NHL. It would free up parking by taking air space over the road.

- *Mike (SHPD): the proposal to situate the station over the highway moves it closer to the NHL. There is the potential for a larger impact.*

Advantage would be more in line of sight with the stadium. It would be more spread out than the block that it is right now. It would be more in line with the stadium.

Comments: I also wanted to add that the proposals we (HHF) made would not move the station and would have made less of an impact on the area. It would impact fewer sub-surface resources. This is a blanket dismissal of the alternatives without looking at the alternatives.

Comments: I want to echo the comments. I haven't read the whole treatment plan. I suspect they will reference the constraints to this site. These include physical constraints and the constraints from the stadium authority. Just getting this information is helpful. The occasion for our discussion is also very specific. This is about meeting stipulation IV.C. The execution of the agreement is about acknowledgement of the impacts and creation of the treatment plan. We have moved into what is possible about the treatment measures. Getting clarification about what we can and cannot do is helpful but we are not way back in the beginning trying to figure out all of the possible configurations of the station design in this area. Its constrained by certain things that FTA and HART have alluded to up to this point.

Comments: There is a continuum in which constraints end up becoming foreclosure of alternatives. That's the territory that we are in. There are many constraints that are either self-imposed or occurred before meaningful consultation that it's improperly limiting the ability to consider ways to minimize and not just mitigate the adverse effects.

- *FTA looks for some degree of consensus and while there are some differences there is not any consensus on the changes being proposed either. I don't know if we have a consensus among the parties that moving the station would significantly change it. We are acknowledging the problems and we need to aim for consensus – what can we get to consensus about? It cannot be just about what any minority or party feels.*
- *This is a topic generating a lot of opinions. Can we get opinions today about whether the station gets moved? Is that something that would be helpful?*

Comments: It premature to try to pin people down today. We can appreciate comments we get today and we may not get to conclusion today. I just don't want to make a decision today and have this come back in the future. We are literally walking through this document. We may not get to that conclusion today.

- *How important is it to note that this issue has been on the table for some months now and we have gone through numerous observations, justifications. What will it take to get the station? The stadium authority will not entertain changes in location including changes to the Ewa direction. The station cannot be located on the curb. The reasons for not moving the station are numerous. We need to dispose of this particular issue and move onto those that we can deal with.*

Comments: There are actually two different alternatives. One is to move the station but HHF suggested not to move the station and reducing the footprint. All of the reasons you give do not apply to that second alternative.

- *It still needs to be evaluated. We need to hear why this would reduce the problems. The suggestions need to be considered in the revision to the plan.*

We have said this before. I don't know how much more clearly I can say this. It feels like there's this barrier where you are no longer hearing comments anymore.

Comments: Relating to changing the footprint - concerns have been raised about changing the footprint, supplemental AIS, iwi kupuna that are avoided by the current footprint. These concerns have been discussed by the cultural descendants. The AIS for Aloha Stadium was based on the current design.

Comments: Why would changing the footprint require a supplemental AIS? HART has said this is not needed since this site has already been evaluated.

Answer: The testing for the touchdowns were done after the reiterations of the possible designs or the changes made were done with the supplemental at the same time and additional tranches were used.

Comments: From architectural historian standpoint, this is not a historic site. It may not be necessary to adjust touch downs. We are not impacting a historic site. To change the touchdown from one location to another – don't know what the impact would be.

Comments: The purpose of the proposed shift is to address the visual impact on the NHL. The proposed shift address that adverse impact.

Comments: I don't know what the changes would do. There would still be an impact no matter where it goes.

- *We will take all of the comments and HART will respond to all of the comments. You will all have an opportunity to respond to the response. Paul, do you want to continue on your presentation of the plan?*

As a summary of Attachment Six, there are treatment measures outlined in the report.

- The plan deals with colors
- There was an acknowledgement that a light color did work well and we need to darken them slightly – we see the need for more earth tone colors.
- We would use a beige color for the stairs.
- We stay away from moss rock
- Sand colors are more of a coral look.
- We need to look at the materials reflective of the island and area, in this case coral.
- It totally changes the appearance.

Comments: Can we not make a moss rock façade? It would be harder for someone to paint on?

Question: Are we using the coral on the short flat building near the escalator?

- Yes

Comments: It depends on what your cultural eye is. If I go to the Big Island, I expect to see lava rock facing. When I see coral facing, it's a little more reflective of Oahu. (Especially in this area). I like the original color schemes.

Suggestion: there is another low building, we can use the same color and material?

Attachment Seven: A lot of this material has been seen before. There is one additional handout on the surface adjacent to the parking lot. We have interpretive signage in this area. We are proposing to increase the amount of interpretive signage. Ken reviewed the signage proposed in the plan.

Wrap Up/Closing Remarks

Liz reviewed schedule again: written comments are requested by May 9<sup>th</sup>, a revised draft will be completed by May 15<sup>th</sup> with final comments requested by May 22<sup>nd</sup>. A final treatment plan will be released on May 29<sup>th</sup>.

In other announcements, invitations for bid packages will go out May 15 with the Aloha Stadium included. The procurement period will take at least 3 months with contractor responses around October. The start of construction will not occur until Spring. We believe we will still have time to addendum things into the package pending this process.

HART will convene an off- site discussion group. This will be done in mid to late May. HART and the Navy have been invited to participate in Federal Highway – National Park Service discussions to look at transportation and other safety type improvement at the visitor center at Pearl Harbor.

Closing Remarks/Adjournment

The next meeting is scheduled for May 22<sup>nd</sup> at 10am. The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:00pm.

---

**Attending Consulting Parties & Signatories**

---

Betsy Merritt	National Trust for Historic Preservation ( <i>dial-in</i> )
Blythe Semmer	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) ( <i>dial-in</i> )
Charlene Oka-Wong	NAVFAC HI, Navy Region Hawai'i
Elaine Jackson-Retondo	National Park Service (NPS) ( <i>dial-in</i> )
Hinaleimoana Wong-Kalu	O'ahu Island Burial Council
Jeffrey Dodge	NAVFAC HI, Navy Region Hawai'i
Jerry Norris	Office of Hawaiian Affairs ( <i>dial-in</i> )
Kiersten Faulkner	Historic Hawai'i Foundation (HHF) ( <i>dial-in</i> )
Mahealani Cypher	O'ahu Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs
Mary Nguyen	FTA ( <i>dial-in</i> )
Mike Gushard	State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD)
Susan Lebo	SHPD
Ted Matley	FTA ( <i>dial-in</i> )

---

**Attending Project Staff**

---

Dawn Chang	Kuiwalu
Gary Omori	Gary Omori
Josh Silva	CH2M Hill
Kathleen Chu	CH2M Hill
Kawika Farm	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART)
Ken Caswell	HART
Liz Scanlon	HART
Lisa Yoshihara	HART
Lorraine Minatoishi	Minatoishi Architects
Mike Yoshida	HART
Paul Cleghorn	Pacific Legacy
Paul Luersen	CH2M Hill
Stan Solamillo	HART

# **Appendix A**

## Agenda

## **Appendix B**

Draft Treatment Plan for Cultural and Historic Resources  
at Aloha Stadium Station  
(dated April 23, 2014)