

**DRAFT**

**Minutes of Meeting with State Historic Preservation Division  
(SHPD), Architecture Branch**

Wednesday, March 19, 2008

Astrid Liverman, SHPD, Acting Architecture Branch Chief  
Susan Tasaki, SHPD, Historical Architect  
Lawrence Spurgeon, PB  
Stephanie Foell, PB  
Mark Stewart, PB  
Ann Yoklavich, Mason Architects  
Dee Ruzicka, Mason Architects

The meeting began about 9:30 a.m.

***Meeting Purpose***

The SHPD was given pre-release copies of the February 25, 2008 Draft Historic Resources Technical Report. An electronic copy had been sent to Astrid and Susan earlier in the week and printed copies were brought to the meeting. The Appendix maps and lists showed the locations and names of 190-plus historic resources evaluated as National-Register eligible by Mason Architects, among the 1,000-plus pre-1969 properties surveyed in the transit project's Area of Potential Effect (APE). The meeting was held in order to begin a dialog with the SHPD on the effects of the project on those resources, and to discuss possible mitigation measures.

***Discussion Points***

The discussion ranged from specific resources and individual effects to general issues and approaches to assessing effects and general types of mitigation. The general comments are summarized first, followed by the more specific ones.

- Evaluating resources achieving significance within the past 50 years and Criteria Consideration G -- Stephanie asked if National Register Criteria Consideration G was being applied to the properties not yet 50 years old. Ann noted that since the First Project would not be finished before 2018, all properties dated 1968 or earlier were evaluated as if they had reached fifty years of age, since they would be at least 50 years old by the time the project was built. However, Criteria Consideration G (exceptional importance) was found applicable to the 1975 building by Vladimir Ossipoff at Pearl Harbor.
- Assessment of adverse effects on districts or potential districts -- SHPD staff agreed that in such cases the district could be listed on a single line, rather than itemizing adverse effect for each individual building.

- Programmatic Agreement (PA) for a Conditional No Adverse Effect (CNAE) finding -- Stephanie raised this possible approach for the transit project, noting it was useful for projects with a large APE and a high number of historic resources, since it can have more creative mitigation than having to match up a mitigation for each resource. She stated that this approach has successfully been employed on some of her mainland projects. Lawrence noted the advantages of making mitigation commitments earlier in the project.
- Mitigation measures that could be incorporated into a PA for a CNAE finding – Discussion included: SHPD review of designs for the stations; interpretive historic displays or commemorative markers in the stations; cultural landscape surveys; National Register nominations; and the typical mitigations measure, Historic American Buildings Survey or Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) reports.
- Overall effect of project and choice of elevated system – SHPD staff expressed concerns about the impact of the project being much larger than the individual effects on many historic properties, and asked why an elevated alternative had been selected. Lawrence explained the combination of not being able to take any surface traffic lanes, the cost of tunneling, and complications with the OR&L right-of-way or developing a new right-of-way through developed areas that led to the selection of the elevated guideway during the alternatives analysis phase.
- Findings of adverse effect appears unavoidable – While the SHPD staff was not opposed to a PA approach, it seemed clear that there was no obvious set of mitigation measures that could clearly avoid all findings of adverse effect.
- Extent of change in setting which would lead to findings of adverse effect – Lawrence sought the SHPD views on this topic, and brought up the examples of bridges, which the transit guideway would run above, but is not expected to touch. SHPD staff stated this was an adverse effect and noted the guideway or a station would change the setting of historic resources.
- Other issues relating to bridges – topics discussed included: possible vibration problems (construction period only, and these could be mitigated); policy ramifications to existing and future SHPD/DOT agreements, if bridges with several periods of railings are evaluated as eligible in this project.
- Need for SHPD to receive forms and report for review prior to official start of "30-day clock" – Since over 1,000 properties were surveyed, SHPD requested materials on the eligibility evaluations and effect assessments before the official request-for-comment letter, which starts their 30-day response clock. They need more than 30 days to accurately review the findings.
- Specific resources or groups of resources for which SHPD would like additional evaluation or research efforts – 1968 building (TMK 15007033) on Kaaahi St.; round-plan buildings (thematic group, especially if all designed by Park); apartment buildings along Kapiolani Boulevard (inventory as a district);

1953-1954 housing along Salt Lake Boulevard (inventory as a district); and Quonset huts at Naval Air Station Barbers Point (inventory as a district).

- Specific resources that SHPD commented on regarding effects –
  - Facilities 282, 1146, and 77 (two hangars and a Bachelor Officers' Quarters) at former Naval Air Station Barbers Point (NASBP), effect of guideway would be adverse. Regarding Facility 77, the reason for alignment running through its center was discussed (future road system layout planned by Hawaii Community Development Authority at Kalaeloa.)
  - Potential NASBP Housing Historic District, effect of station and guideway would be adverse.
  - Facility 1 (Admin. Building), Facility 2 (Bombproof Command Center), Facility 5 (Chapel), Facility 1710 (Parachute Shop), Facility 128 (Radio Transmitter Building), large and small antenna bases, various Quonset huts, and Facilities 828 etc. (Ready Magazines) at NASBP, no adverse effect.
  - TPSS at HECO Waiiau property, effect would not be adverse.
  - Aiea Plantation Cemetery (although Lawrence mentioned that efforts had been made to avoid it), effect of guideway would be adverse because so close.
  - Ossipoff's Aloha Chapel (Facility 1514 at Pearl Harbor), effect of station and guideway would be adverse.
  - Facility S-51 (Splinterproof Shelter at Pearl Harbor), effect of guideway would be adverse.
  - Dillingham Transportation Building, effect of station (and guideway?) would be adverse.
  - Employers' Council Building on Waiwai Loop, since guideway runs on its rear side, minor adverse effect.

SHPD requested a copy of the visual impacts technical report.

### ***Next Meeting and Action Items***

Both PB and Mason Architects pledged to assist the SHPD by providing groupings of forms before the beginning of the 30-day SHPD review period.

No specific meeting date was set, but it was made clear that Mason Architects personnel would be available to the SHPD staff for meetings, field visits, or questions by phone or e-mail, at any time.

The meeting ended about 12:30 p.m