

### HART/Kāko‘o Meeting

---

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

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

---

The following materials are attached to these minutes as follows:

Appendix A Agenda

Appendix B PowerPoint Presentation (not distributed)

#### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order by Joseph Lapilio (facilitator) and started with self-introductions. The purpose of the monthly scheduled meeting with the Signatory and Consulting Parties is to provide updates on the Programmatic Agreement. The focus of the July meeting was to provide specific updates on the Chinatown Station Plaza on Kekaulike Street and the Historic Preservation Fund, and general project updates.

#### CHINATOWN STATION PLAZA ON KEKAULIKE STREET UPDATE (Stanley Solamillo)

HART acquired a parcel for the touchdown station in Chinatown. The boundaries of the property were reviewed on the PowerPoint presentation.

The first parcel discussed was 928 Kekaulike. It was identified in 1998 as a historic property under the guidelines of integrity, setting and association. It was found that the rail project would have no direct impact to the building. In 2014, it was initially proposed to remove the building to provide a larger plaza for the station. After HART reviewed the site it has decided to preserve it as it is doing for the adjacent building (930 Kekaulike). HART is now considering a number of re-use options. We are at the starting process in exploring options. The project can qualify for tax credits (historic and new markets) and this could be used for the project eventually chosen.

Photos of both buildings were displayed for the meeting. Stanley will conduct field work on both buildings beginning this weekend.

During our previous presentation on the Holau Marketplace, we were in the initial stage in our research. Since then we have discovered two parallel interpretations of the building's history. The updated research has discovered that the Holau Building was not associated with Charles Holau but with a Mary Helen Longki (maiden name Holau). She acquired the property through several transactions and her second husband built the building. She died the year the building was built and he named it Holau Market with a caveat to the estate papers that the building will always carry the name.

The other historical information is from an old tradition that there was a hui of lei sellers and stevedores and they were the ones to open a market selling produce and leis. They wanted a way to get fish, poi and other staples. This was a way to get Hawaiians back into Chinatown. A number of the hui members came from Papakolea but others come from other areas of Honolulu. We are still trying to track down the information from Hawaiian language newspapers. Other newspapers of the time do not mention this at all.

The most recent item that has surfaced is a song entitled *Holau*, written in 1921 about the building and performed by Lena Machado. The lyrics were reviewed and a recording of the song done by Lena Machado was shared with the meeting.

This history is buried under layers of other histories. Trying to uncover this will take time but it will add to the history of Hawaiians during the territory period.

#### HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND UPDATE (Stanley Solamillo)

This is very important to HART and a part of the Programmatic Agreement which included the establishment of a historic preservation committee and the solicitation of project proposals. Two million dollars were set aside for project improvements.

Although we had initial difficulties coordinating a meeting time with Historic Preservation Committee members, we did meet with quorum.

An overview of project proposals included two that were deferred and they will be invited to come back. There is some overage that can be carried over into next year. Projects included awning repairs, air conditioner unit relocations from building frontages to rooftops, redesign of retail spaces, lighting, removal of outside electrical conduits, improvements to the appearances of facades, signage and sign restoration, graffiti removal (and preventive materials), windows, (A complete list of the awards is on the list in the power point presentation). The total allocated to these projects is about \$550,000. The committee decided to work on a graffiti removal project for the entire district that will be presented to the business owners.

Proposals from 501(c)(3) organizations do not require a property owner match. The match from private owners is not fixed at a 50% match, it varies and is based looking at the needs of the project. Much of the work supported was stabilization.

The buildings selected add to the history of the area. Some of these projects qualify for historic tax credits.

Comment: This was one of the stipulations that was to relate to overall effects. It has taken several years to determine what the parameters are and as the committee works on this it is pretty exciting. There was some concerns that the presentation of projects did not match the notes from one of the committee members and this will be discussed after the meeting.

While there are comments about quorum, the committee has had 100% participation from its members. It was a scheduling issue not a participation issue. While there was reference to bringing new people to the committee to make quorum, the PA doesn't allow this.

At the next meeting, the committee will go over the details on how the funds will be released.

#### GENERAL PROJECT UPDATES (Jon Nouchi)

Construction is going well along the Westside of the route and there are 111 columns up. Design treatment for the columns has started and the first has been imprinted on the Ho`opili station. We are looking at getting all of these designs together for presentation perhaps at an upcoming CP meeting.

The airport community meeting is coming up on August 13<sup>th</sup> in the evening. We welcome participation and we did have a press conference last week to unveil the plan. We are working on scheduling the second community meeting in the fall.

We are working on the city center stations and a meeting will be scheduled sometime in September or October. There will be four stations presented in one meeting and four in a second meeting. There is too much information to cover for one meeting on all eight stations.

SHPD approved the Supplemental AIS along the Queen Street route. Protocols are in place in the event of iwi discovery along this re-route. We have been regularly consulting with the recognized cultural descendants and will provide updates to the OIBC at its upcoming August 13 public meeting at 10am.

Question: Is there going to be some write up about the design treatment for the columns? *The art will be included in a flat design at each station and there will be a story of the design. The designs are unique to the ahupua`a in which the station is located.*

HART is on the agenda for the Historic Review Board on August 23<sup>rd</sup> for the Makalapa District.

Question: HHF asked whether HART was going to consult with the SP and CPs on the Makalapa District Nominations that will be presented to the Historic Places Review Board on August 23, 2014.

Question: When will information on the Makalapa nominations be available? *HART will put them on the website after the nominations clear the State Board of Review and they are recommended for transmittal to Historic Places Review Board. To expedite information sharing, HART will make CDs available.*

Comment: A year ago, when Navy and HART were having consultations on this issue, the NAVY prepared a POAM that included a schedule of milestones for the Makalapa nomination and the transfer of land from the Navy to HART for the Pearl Harbor Station. It was their understanding that HART would consult with the CPs prior to submission of the nomination forms to SHPD. It seems HART went over the comment period and went straight to the Historic Review Board. The CPs have not seen it. *The drafts went to the Kakoo and the two versions went to the architects. A draft was routed to the signatories for comment in October 2013. It was an incredibly compressed schedule.*

Question: How are we linking it back to the schedule to time it accordingly? There was a telecom with the park service regarding the landmark update and there was a request for the second draft document. We understood that they had a final nomination.

- SHPD procedures are to not release a nomination to the public until after the review board members get it. A final draft is available now. It cannot be changed now until the review board reviews it. In their deliberations, they can concur with the nomination as is or make recommendations for changes as a condition of a determination of eligibility. At that time, SHPD will work with HART to make a final draft. It doesn't have to go back to the review board unless they ask for it.
- Technically the version we now have is a draft. Comments can be added. The review allows anyone to make official comments – written or oral. The review board does not have to take those comments into consideration.

Question: Does the review board respond to comments?

- They can but it is up to them. They can take it into consideration or move ahead without addressing individual comments. Comments do not automatically go with the

package to the keeper. Separate comments can be made directly to the keeper in support of or not with concerns listed.

- The Navy has received a copy of the draft. Because it is an outside agency nominating a historic property, the submittal is through SHPD. After the review, the Navy takes it up to the keeper.

Question: Is the nomination is based on the military history? *It includes the Hawaiian history as well.*

Comments: A process issue - comments do not necessarily have to be addressed. When it gets to the keeper, if the nomination has a thousand objections, will they resolve this? Where does it come back to for resolution? Should we try to address the comments? It would not work to have major community objections. Why are we not trying to address the concerns? This group certainly has disagreements on boundaries and other issues. Hard hitting questions like these need to be resolved.

- The review board does not address individual comments to prevent them from having to respond to people with objections for personal reasons and/or don't want an action taken. If the complaints have concerns about the quality of the content those are legitimate concerns. If the review board does take these concerns into consideration, the keeper will likely take a look at it.

Comments: We want to make sure the nominations are made with respect to the whole project. Luluku is an example where the community did not know about the submittal and did not make objections in time for the keeper. It is important that there be time for community concerns to be aired.

- One of the options the Historic Review Board could do is defer. The board meets quarterly. It is not uncommon for them to defer and research on their own to make a more informed determination. The board is comprised of people with the capability to do so. But it is uncommon for the board to make an out-of-cycle meeting and decision. These nominations are the only projects being submitted for their review.
- If you want to make comments, make comments that help to edit the nomination as it is rather than to compel a re-write. The nomination can continue to move forward with the board approving but with stipulations that need to be met. They prefer the least amount of contention.

Comments: With the preview of the CDs there can be a separate meeting with a vetting process. They can be an opportunity to review it and identify issues. We can take time to have staff go over the nomination.

A meeting was set up for next Thursday, July 31 at 1 pm after HART has the opportunity to send the CD to all CPs and when everyone has the CD in hand. Everyone will be notified on the location of the meeting.

#### OPEN DISCUSSION AND WRAP-UP

Comments and Questions: A flag on an issue of concern. At the annual meeting, can we discuss the effectiveness of the PA and the role of the Kakoo? The Kakoo meetings have morphed into a HART meeting. The Kakoo role was to serve as a liaison. I feel he has gone silent. Are they doing design review? Are they resolving the questions coming up? It deserves some reflection. Can this function be improved? Do we still need this role? We still don't have the best practices which we were supposed to get this some

time ago. It is a growing concern followed by decreasing involvement, communication has dropped. The role seems more on the side of the project rather than being a fair arbiter of the issues. It appears that the position has been co-opted by HART. Even the meetings notices don't come from him. It comes from C2HM.

*The role is for the CPs. HART paying the bill. Maybe we need more visibility and some guidance is needed to be more effective. We have to figure out but it can't be HART prodding. If HART takes it to address this, it continues the perception of HART controlling this.*

Question: Is it public record how much is being spent on this function?

HART will check.

Comments: Meeting minutes need to accurately reflect the concerns we are sharing at this time. Maybe we cannot wait until the annual meeting and we need to improve this for us.

If he is functioning more like a HART advocate, is this the best fit for the position of the Kakoo. We need to make sure the final product is handled objectively to prevent legal challenges.

*There is a contract in place and there are mechanism to make changes. The CPs should not be stuck with the issue.*

*Should this go to the next meeting? This won't be at the historic review. This will be at the next PA meeting. Paul can then bring information about his role and address the concerns being shared today.*

Comments: The Kakoo has done a great job. But it is important that we deal with this because it is the first time this is being tried and we need to do this right. There are two pages in the PA and this is a major part of the agreement. We should review this and determine how we proceed.

*Is there someone from the consulting parties that can contact him and let him know? If the CPs can ask for the contract to review the role and understand the vision.*

It doesn't make sense that his office cannot make it to this meeting. We are here and we aren't being paid

Umi will follow up and talk to the Kakoo prior to the next meeting. It was suggested that he send the CPs a report on what he is doing, how much time he is spending and to get a better sense what changes you want.

Comments: The monthly reports were just distributed. In the April report, it is noted that Historic Hawaii Foundation's objections were resolved and that is not true. For the record HHF still has a standing objection to the Aloha Stadium issue. It was filed in January. There has been no written response from FTA. There have been meetings and discussions but the objection has not been formally closed. The focus of the dispute was the application of Section IV.

There is a requirement that there be a final finding and this has not occurred. There is a treatment plan process which may be an assumption of a finding but there is nothing in writing.

Essentially the consultants made a recommendation on their findings. The fact that you are in the treatment plan process assumes the finding has been made. For the record, that should be formal. Everything we are doing with Aloha Stadium is precedent for everything else and we need to get it right.

Regarding the treatment plan itself, HART has responded poorly to those comments if at all. With all of these outstanding issues, we are not satisfied that our objection has been resolved. We will continue that objection until we feel this has been resolved.

- *FTA: We understand that there is not a level of comfort that we responded to comments as best we could. We will just continue to work through the PA but at this time we will try to wrap up the treatment plan.*
- *HART: The inaccuracy in the April report was an oversight. It will be corrected. How can we formally move forward? A memo, some communication. I thought I did respond but I will check. The list was the other thing.*

Comments: I sent an email last week about the treatment plan to Jon. I haven't heard anything is response to that. The summary notes from some meetings isn't a true representation of the concerns about the Stadium station.

Comments: We have asked not to use a bcc because it is impossible to make sure that everyone who received your email gets a response.

- *We haven't cc'd everyone because of confidentiality. But this keeps coming up as an issue. Some don't want their emails disclosed. We can get an updated list of CPs to you. We will work with everyone to update the email list and ask those that want to be bcc'd to get another email separate from their personal one.*

Questions: At our June 26<sup>th</sup> meeting, we discussed the Pearl Harbor Station. The materials from that meeting were sent two days ago and posted two days ago. What would be a reasonable period for follow up comments? How can this be handled?

- *HART will work on fixing this. Would thirty days be okay for now until we can work on this? We will get the materials posted immediately so we can discuss the minutes at the following meeting.*
- On a related issue, the website is hard to navigate. We will work with our people to improve the site.

Are there other items:

Comments: Regarding the treatment plan for the Aloha Stadium station. HHF sent written comments on the draft plan well within the 10 day comment period and none of these comments are incorporated into the final document. I feel that is not good faith consultation. No one else's comments were incorporated. There are the substantive issues of what the station will look like and there are the procedural issues about what consultation really means.

Comments: We were talking about this at SHPD, discussing about what consultation means and noticing that too. There should be a good faith effort to include them. But if they are not, they should be included in some way with the comments listed so that at least we have an understanding of why the comments could not, be incorporated into the

draft. At least there would be communication about what is going on and acknowledging that the comment was heard and at least contemplated.

Questions: Is that is issue that the Kakoo might have been able to resolve? We come because we care about the issues. We want to make sure we are not here wasting our time just so you can check off the boxes. The stuff you got from HHF should have had some that would be valuable for your work instead of it just being blown off. Is that the way it is going to be? We need to see why you couldn't do it.

Comments: Another comment on the Aloha Stadium station. Wouldn't it make more sense to step back and look at whether the new stadium would allow changes?

- *There is a huge if there. I don't know if holding the project up would work. There are two plans floating right now. It has not materialized. There is no funding mechanism. They are exploring. We cannot design around something that is not sure.*

Question: Will the time table on Aloha Stadium be held off?

- We will take some time to review whether we have responded correctly. We need to look at that internally. I thought we did, but there are enough comments to tell us otherwise.

\*\*\* Meeting adjourned at 12:00pm \*\*\*

### **Attending Consulting Parties & Signatories**

---

Mahealani Cypher	Oahu Council, Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs
Jeffrey Dodge	NAVFAC HI, Navy Region Hawaii
Kiersten Faulkner	Historic Hawaii Foundation
Tanya Gumapac-McGuire	Hawaii Historic Foundation
Elaine Jackson-Retondo	National Park Service (dial-in)
Kaonohi Kaleikini	Descendant
Moani Kaleikini	Descendant
Susan Lebo	SHPD
John Lohr	NAVFAC HI, Navy Region Hawaii
Ted Matley	FTA (dial-in)
Betsy Merritt	National Trust for Historic Preservation ( <i>dial-in</i> )
Jerry Norris	Office of Hawaiian Affairs (dial-in)
Charlene Oka-Wong	NAVFAC HI, Navy Region Hawaii
Jessica Puff	SHPD
Umi Sexton	Descendant

### **Attending Project Staff**

---

Dawn Chang	Kuiwalu
Kawika Farm	HART
Joseph Lapilio	Facilitator
Jon Nouchi	HART

Liz Scanlon  
Josh Silva  
Stan Solamillo

HART  
CH2M Hill  
HART

# **Appendix A**

## Agenda

## **Appendix B**

### PowerPoint Presentation