

**HONOLULU HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION (SHPD)
MEETING MINUTES**

Date: Thursday, February 9, 2006

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Place: SHPD Office, Kakuhihewa Building, Kapolei

Attendees: Melanie Chinen (SHPD), Chris Monohan (SHPD), David Brown (SHPD), Susan Tasaki (SHPD) Pi'ilani Chang (SHPD), Katherine Kasmir (SHPD), Faith Miyamoto (DTS), Polly Cosson (Mason Architects), Dawn Chang (Ku'iwalu), Matt McDermott (Cultural Surveys Hawaii), Lawrence Spurgeon (Parsons Brinckerhoff), Alex Buttarò (Parsons Brinckerhoff)

Comments/Corrections and Verification Statement: Anyone noting any error or omission in this document: please notify Alex Buttarò (566-2235) within two weeks of document receipt.

Advance materials: 1) Meeting Agenda; 2) Honolulu High-Capacity Corridor Project AA/DEIS Scoping Package (Slightly updated graphics to be presented at meeting)

Materials presented at meeting:

1. "Draft" Process Flowchart
2. "Study areas," discuss graphic(s)
3. Draft methodologies: level of detail, scope/ comprehensiveness. (HANDOUTS)
4. Identify and initiate consultation with cultural resources stakeholders—both community groups and individuals: provide a preliminary list for review to SHPD.

Distribution: Meeting Attendees

Purpose of Meeting: To solicit input and obtain concurrence from SHPD regarding technical reports, methodologies, and study areas for archaeology, culture, and historic buildings.

1.0 SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Participant introductions were made and roles were discussed. The meeting purpose and overviews of the project and corridor descriptions were provided, including study areas, and summaries of the regulatory processes and timelines that apply to the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project were outlined. Prior transit new start projects were reviewed, and it was noted that much of the previous work is still relevant to the proposed project. PB will submit an Alternatives Analysis report to Honolulu City Council that describes the officially screened options and their relative relationship to one another, and upon the City's determination of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)—Section 106 process to commence on LPA once determined, production of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) will commence. Methodologies were presented for reports to be written for archaeology, historic buildings, and cultural resources.

2.0 PRIMCOR ANALYSIS

Compared to Primcor analysis performed in 2003, today the scope has increased to address the long-range transportation needs for Oahu.

3.0 STUDY AREAS AND ALIGNMENT OPTIONS

The AA will be a broad-brushed planning document of the study areas.

- Proposed study areas were reviewed. Maps with potential stations and alignments were presented.

5.0 HISTORIC BUILDINGS METHODOLOGY

- Today, for the proposed Transit project, 1965 is now our cutoff date due to a project horizon of 2015.
- Building data will be assembled into a list: study area is one tax map lot deep, but some buildings are a mile away that fit these criteria. An in-depth view plane analysis will be done for the LPA, after that determination has been made.
- The Draft EIS will address elevated sections of station stops, etc. but for now it's just an inventory. Context studies may need to be done, but not at this stage.

6.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES METHODOLOGY

- The archaeological consultant noted that archaeological methodology is standardized to industry protocols.
- Not much archaeology was done in Primcor due to the fact Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) would use existing infrastructure and would therefore cause no adverse impacts to archaeology.
- Mitigation will be focused on monitoring.
- Data to be examined will include: 1) Soil survey data; 2) SAS data; 3) LCA awards; 3) Waihona Aina database may be used.
- Sandborn Fire Insurance Maps will be used to identify building sites

5.0 CULTURAL RESOURCES METHODOLOGY

- The cultural resources consultant has met with OHA an OEQC, and they have indicated concurrence with the proposed cultural resources methodology.
- Ahupua'a scope may not be appropriate in an urban setting, although the cultural resources consultant proposed a methodology that identified areas previously surveyed, confirms that the same site still exists, and determine if there are new ones: Waianae to Diamond Head will be studied at the ahupua'a level, with traditional practices included.

- A massive letter campaign to contact all groups will supplement any lack of ethnographic interviews
- A preliminary cultural resources community resources contact list was passed around the meeting: organization on the list will be sent a letter that will ask for identification of cultural practices in area, and references to their network: letter should go about by February 2006, with responses hopefully received by March 2006.
- The project consultant environmental lead stated that if a fatal flaw is found, an alignment could be taken off the table. SHPD staff noted that it is important for people to hear there are alternatives and decisions are not final yet—good PR for the community.

6.0 MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

6.01 SHPD CONTACTS

Architecture: Susan Tasaki will be the key visual and architectural reviewer
Archaeology: Chris Monohan and David Brown will be the SHPD archeological reviewers
Cultural: The cultural contact will be Pi'ilani Chang.

6.02 NEXT STEPS

Submission of methodology report to SHPD in will occur in March of 2006.

**HONOLULU HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION (SHPD) MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET**

SHPD Office, Kakuhihewa Building, Kapolei
February 9, 2006, 10:00 am

PLEASE PRINT

| | Name | Representing | Address | City, State, Zip | Telephone No. |
|----|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1 | POLLY COSSON | MAEON ARCHITECTS | 119 MERCHANT ST #501 | HON HI 96813 | 536-0556 |
| 2 | PATTH MIYAMOTO | DTS | 650 S. KING ST. 9 th FL. | HON. HI 96813 | 587-6976 |
| 3 | Lawrence Spurgeon | Parsons Brinckerhoff | | | 566-2226 |
| 4 | DAWN CHANG | Kuiwaku | | | 539-8583 |
| 5 | Mat + McDermott | CSH | Box 1114 Kailua, HI 96736 | | 262-9972 |
| 6 | Chats Moneka | SHPD-Oahu | | | |
| 7 | PILLANI CHANG | SHPD - OAHU | 601 KAMUKILA BLVD. PM 555 | | 692-8016 |
| 8 | EMMAN TAGAKI | SHPD - OAHU | " | | " |
| 9 | KATHLEEN KASNER | SHPD - OAHU | " | | " |
| 10 | ALEX BUIJTARO | PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF | | | |
| 11 | Davis P. P. P. | SHPD - OAHU | 601 KAMUKILA BLVD 555 | | 692-8015 |
| 12 | Melanie Chinen | SHPD | " | | 692-8015 |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | |

Meeting Minutes

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| Date: | September 25, 2007 | | | |
| Location: | SHPD Office, Kapolei | | | |
| Attendees: | Name | Company | Other Information | |
| | Melanie Chinen | SHPD | Administrator | |
| | Lauren Morawski | SHPD | O'ahu Archaeologist | |
| | Teresa Davan | SHPD | O'ahu Assistant Archaeologist | |
| | James Hayes | PB | | |
| | Matt McDermott | CSH | | |
| Meeting Minutes Distribution: | Name | Company | Date | Via |
| | Melanie Chinen | SHPD | 28-Sep-07 | Email |
| | Lauren Morawski | SHPD | 28-Sep-07 | Email |
| | Faith Miyamoto | CCH-DTS | 28-Sep-07 | Email |
| | Susan Robbins | InfraConsult | 28-Sep-07 | Email |
| Modifications | None | | | |
| Re-Distribute: | Name | Company | Date | Via |
| | None | | | |

Discussion:

Jim and Matt presented the project in general to SHPD – discussed LPA, first project, and EIS preparation. EIS will cover entire LPA, but extensions beyond the first project will not be as detailed at this point (but will be included to catch cumulative impacts and such).

Matt reminded everyone of their discussion during AA phase – then the plan had been to do an inventory survey plan to support the DEIS, with inventory survey investigation to support the FEIS. Say all that has changed now. Jim and Matt discuss reasons for change:

- Alignment is still changing in select areas
- Location of support columns is still not set and will not be set before DEIS or probably FEIS.

Discuss that it would be premature to do an inventory survey before we have column locations more or less finalized. Therefore, we want to delay inventory surveys until a time when column locations and other areas of disturbance are more defined. During the DEIS and FEIS we would like to reach an agreement that would outline how surveys and reviews by SHPD and others would take place once the engineering reaches a level detail sufficient to perform a survey. The agreement would include survey methods (i.e. survey detail level

may be more detailed in Kaka'ako than Pearl City), periods of review for SHPD, and additional details. Surveys could be performed in sections as engineering is developed instead of the entire corridor at once; inventory surveys would progress from west to east along the first project at least one year in advance of construction.

Melanie and others agree that this sounds like a reasonable plan at this point. They want to be sure that the engineering design is not "Final" to the point that the only mitigation available would be recovery/relocation. Jim and Matt indicate that, although the survey will not occur until a relatively final design is available, there will be room for modifications/redesign based on inventory survey findings. Redesign could include moving a column one way or the other a fair amount or using a different column geometry. However, radical measures such as moving the alignment to a different street or area would not be available.

Discuss funding for the project: both federal and county funds. Melanie says both Chapter 6(e) and Section 106 will need to be met. We agree. We have been focused on Section 106 for the NEPA EIS at this point but any agreement would state that state requirements must be complied with.

Melanie suggests taking our approach to other stakeholders soon. Also suggests using facilitators and others such as Kui Walu to connect with individuals or organizations better. We agree: we are on the OIBC agenda for this month, we are working with Kui Walu already, and our team will be meeting with these and other stakeholders early and often.

Melanie indicates that individuals and groups associated with Waikīkī and Kaka'ako tend to be the most difficult to connect with and emphasis should be placed on those areas because finds are likely along Halekauwila, Queen, and Kona Streets plus Waikīkī. Jim indicates that it will be some time before we get around to anything in Waikīkī because it is considered an extension from the first project.

Discuss schedule:

- Groundbreaking: end of 2009
- DEIS out: June 2008
- First segment open: 2012

Jim indicates that groundbreaking will likely be something in the maintenance and storage facility (M&SF). Both M&SF options are heavily disturbed areas. We could early start the Section 106/Chapter 6(e) process for the selected M&SF so that groundbreaking would be cleared.

Melanie provides a contact for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation: Kelly Y. Fanizzo, 202-606-8583, jfanizzo@achp.gov

Melanie and others will learn more general project information during our October 9, 2007 general kickoff meeting.

END.

Meeting Minutes

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| Date: | October 9, 2007 | | | |
| Location: | SHPD Office, Kapolei | | | |
| Attendees: | Name | Company | Other Information | |
| | Lauren Morawski | SHPD | O'ahu Archaeologist | |
| | Teresa Davan | SHPD | O'ahu Assistant Archaeologist | |
| | Bryan Flower | SHPD | Architectural Historian | |
| | Susan Tasaki | SHPD | Historic Architect | |
| | James Hayes | PB | Transit EIS team | |
| | Lawrence Spurgeon | PB | Transit EIS team | |
| | Lani Lapilio | Ku'iwalu | Transit cultural specialist | |
| | Faith Miyamoto | CCH-DTS | Transit management | |
| | Susan Robbins | InfraConsult | Transit management | |
| Meeting Minutes Distribution: | Name | Company | Date | Via |
| | Lauren Morawski | SHPD | Oct. 11, 2007 | Email |
| | Bryan Flower | SHPD | Oct. 11, 2007 | Email |
| | Lani Lapilio | Ku'iwalu | Oct. 11, 2007 | Email |
| | Matt McDermott | CSH | Oct. 11, 2007 | Email |
| | Faith Miyamoto | CCH-DTS | Oct. 11, 2007 | Email |
| | Susan Robbins | InfraConsult | Oct. 11, 2007 | Email |
| Modifications: | None | | | |
| Re-Distribute: | Name | Company | Date | Via |
| | None | | | |

Discussion:

Following introductions, the transit team described the planned transit project to SHPD personnel. The transit project will do both a state and federal EIS for the project with three build alternatives. The transit team handed out copies of scoping input received that relates to historic resources and figures illustrating the project alignment. Reviewed project schedule, alignment, alternatives, and technologies. Discussed that the extensions beyond the first project will not be covered at the same level of detail as the first project.

Discussed that we plan to enter into Section 106 consultation and this meeting was to set the stage for official Section 106 consultation. The transit team is working on establishing an area of potential effect (APE) and plans to use 1968 as the horizon year for the evaluation of

historic structures. Following some additional coordination, the transit team will submit a letter to formally kickoff the Section 106 process.

The general approach being considered for archaeological resources is to defer inventory survey until design is close to final so that the placement of columns is well established and unlikely to change unless archaeological finds are made. The inventory survey work would be done at least a year prior to construction so that redesign could occur if resources are identified. The transit project would like to establish a MOA setting out protocol for surveys, reviews/ consultations, mitigation, and other matters related to archaeology. The MOA could be finalized during the final EIS stage (winter 2008/09). Field work for the first segment (construction to start late 2009 between UH West O'ahu and LCC) could be done prior to the MOA but areas beyond that first segment would be deferred and managed under the MOA.

Lauren M. indicated that the most sensitive area for archaeological resources (burials) is Waikīkī. Transit team agreed, but because Waikīkī is an extension not in the first project, it will be treated more programmatically and under the MOA. The transit team also indicated it is likely that by the time funding is identified for the Waikīkī extension we would need to do a supplemental EIS that would reopen the Section 106 consultation process.

Lauren M. also suggested using areas that have been disturbed previously if possible (areas of abandoned utilities for example). Transit team agreed that would be our preference as well but we need to avoid active utilities.

Lauren M. suggested that re-internment sites be identified prior to getting too far along. The transit team indicated we have not established any yet and need to coordinate with the O'ahu Island Burial Council (OIBC) and others to research and identify re-internment sites. Lani L. indicates she will be working with cultural descendents along with Matt M. on behalf of the transit team and will work to find ways to identify re-internment sites.

Discussed that station design is flexible to a degree. Most stations may have a standard look, but in sensitive areas individual designs are possible.

Discussed SHPD staffing: Bryan F. indicated SHPD staff is near full strength now. The SHPD GIS is being worked on apparently but was not up and running yet.

Bryan F. and Lauren M. thought there is no Act 50 review within SHPD, but Lani L. should check with Auntie Kaleo regarding that. Auntie Kaleo Paik also has a list of 9 new groups to contact for cultural coordination. SHPD personnel also indicated the transit team should coordinate with the Advisory Council early in the process too. We indicate we have made first contact with the council already.

SHPD contacts for Section 106 are generally as follows: Susan T. for transportation projects; Bryan F. for military projects.

END.

Parsons
Brinckerhoff Computation Sheet

Subject SHPD Introduction Mtg

Page _____ of _____
 Made by _____
 Date _____
 Checked by _____
 Date 10-9-07

| Name | ORG | E-mail | Phone |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|----------|
| Lawrence Spurgeon | PB | spurgeon@pbworld.com | 566-2226 |
| Jim Hayes | PB | hayesja@pbworld.com | 566-2239 |
| Lani Maa Lapilio | Kuiwala | llapilio@kuiwala.com | 539-3592 |
| Susan Robbins | InfraConsult | robbins@infraconsultllc.com | 536-6610 |
| FARTH MIYAMOTO | DTS | fmiyamoto@hondulu.gov | 768-8250 |
| Teresa Davan | SHPD Archaeology | Teresa.E.Davan@hawaii.gov | 692-8029 |
| Lauren Morawski | SHPD - Oahu Arch | Lauren.M.Morawski@hawaii.gov | 692-8019 |
| SUSAN TASAKI | SHPD - Archit. | Susan.Y.Tasaki@hawaii.gov | 692-8032 |
| Bryan Flower | SHPD -> Archit. hist. | Bryan.t.Flower@hawaii.gov | 692-8027 |

Agenda
Meeting with SHPD Architecture Branch
10/11/2007

Background of Architectural Surveys done for previous Transit Projects (MAI)

Brief summary of current Transit Project (PB)

Summarize work done in 2006 as part of Alternatives Analysis for current Transit Project (MAI)

Proposed approach for upcoming Inventory (MAI)

- discuss assumptions about Area of Potential Effect
- discuss proposed templates for types of inventory forms

Ask SHPD if other interested parties known, other than Historic Hawaii Foundation

Discuss schedule of forms submission

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

Thursday, October 11, 2007

Bryan Flower, SHPD, Architecture Branch Chief
Susan Tasaki, SHPD, Historic Architect
Ann Yoklavich, Mason Architects
Dee Ruzicka, Mason Architects
Wendy Wichman, Mason Architects
Jim Hayes, PB

Project Overview and Status

An overview of the current project had been provided at the meeting PB held on Tuesday, Oct. 9 for all the SHPD branches. Jim Hayes said he would request the Department of Transportation Services (DTS) to send SHPD Architecture Branch a printed copy of the Alternatives Analysis Historic and Archaeological Technical Report, but he gave them the CD in the back of his copy. He explained that the DTS had hired InfraConsult to manage this project, acting as City agents.

Ann presented the background of architectural survey work done for previous transit projects, in the late 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. The Final EISs for those previous transit projects were completed in 1982, ca. 1992, and 2003. The inventory of historic properties done for the AA phase of the current project in 2006 was discussed. Dee explained his field work was based on a list of properties, generated from Tax Office records and organized by tax map key (TMK), given to Mason Architects by PB. This list included properties with buildings that dated from 1965 and earlier. He also expanded the list to include historic resources noted during field work, such as historic bridges or older buildings that were not on the Tax office list. He took photos of each structure or building, and did a preliminary assessment in the field regarding its eligibility. The ones assessed as eligible for the National Register are listed in the Appendix to the Historic and Archaeological Technical Report published in May 2007. Photo sheets of all of these eligible ("yes") resources were provided, and photos of sample "no" buildings were also presented for discussion. Mason Architects requested SHPD to identify other interested parties, besides Historic Hawaii Foundation.

Proposed Methodology for Draft EIS phase

This phase of the historic properties survey and inventory is considering the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) route only. There was discussion about proceeding now with the assumption that the **Area of Potential Effect (APE) will be defined as one tax map lot deep on either side of the LPA route.** It was noted that the PB engineers are still deciding on the transit station locations, and making a few other changes in the alignment. The set of engineering drawings are expected to be available at the end of October. Jim promised to have sets sent to Mason Architects and SHPD Architecture Branch once they have been finalized.

There was discussion about the proposed templates for the types of inventory forms, using the same format as for the Primary Corridor Transit (Prime-Cor) project. The sample forms for properties that were either considered potentially eligible or evaluated as probably not NR eligible were presented. No objections were raised to **this project using the one-page inventory forms employed by the Prime-Cor project**. There was some discussion about how to schedule the submission to SHPD of the approximately 800 forms expected to be generated. It was agreed that arriving at a consensus with the SHPD regarding the assessment of eligibility of such a large number of properties could not occur by the mid-January 2008 deadline for Mason Architects to submit its section of the draft EIS to PB. That section will include lists and state the status of ongoing consultations with the SHPD. Work on the forms will probably have to continue after that date. The forms will not be included in the Draft or Final EIS, but will be available as back-up information. It was generally agreed that **forms for all the properties that were 1968 and older, but deemed not eligible would be provided to SHPD first, perhaps submitted in sections. Those evaluated as eligible would be a smaller number and could be done last.**

A decision was made to meet in November with SHPD to conduct a visual drive-by inspection of pre-1969 properties along the LPA route.

In addition to the architectural survey and eligibility assessments, **SHPD asked that additional research be done on the following topics related to the LPA route:**

1. the Kapiolani Blvd. trees, as an historical landscape feature;
2. Kakaako housing, to look at how many residential houses are left;
3. Salt Lake Blvd. plantation-style residences;
4. history of Waimanu-Queen St. area; and
5. the history of the HECO plant and Irwin Park area.

The information collected for these mini-context studies will be included on the forms for eligible properties in those designated areas.

There was also discussion about the level of study for the future extensions of the project, including Kapolei, University, and Waikiki extensions. SHPD suggested that the same type of forms be prepared as for the rest of the corridor. It was agreed that there could be less intensive mitigation analysis, since future EIS supplements would require this anyway.

Engineering Issues

Jim Hayes, PB, described the engineering of the rapid transit system and some of the design issues relating to various technologies. The standard transit guideway and stations without mezzanines height is 32 feet, but where there is a mezzanine level it could be 45 feet or higher. The Ala Moana transit station is planned to be 80 feet high. There was some discussion of sound barriers. Jim explained that sound barriers were possible and also sound barrier "flaps" that covered the wheels on some types of transit technologies. Susan asked whether different technologies had varying curves. Jim said they all had to approach curves by slowing down and the goal was to minimize slowing down, but also noted that some technologies can navigate tighter corners than others.

Next Meeting and Action Items

The next meeting is planned in a couple of weeks with SHPD to conduct a visual drive-by inspection of the pre-1968 properties along the LPA. This joint field work is intended to facilitate SHPD's input as a participating party in the Section 106 consultation. It is also expected to expedite consensus on eligibility.

The following action items were identified during the meeting:

- DTS (delegated authority by Federal Transit Authority) will be sending a letter to SHPD and other consulted parties soon to initiate the Section 106 consultation process.
- SHPD will review the Proposed Outline of Work provided by Mason and provide comments before the end of October 2007.
- Mason and PB will coordinate to set up the corridor tour with SHPD staff.
- Mason will contact Historic Hawaii Foundation and Jeff Dodge at the Navy to assist in the identification and evaluation of historic resources.
- PB will provide everyone with the latest conceptual alignment plans and profiles (including station locations) in early November.

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

DRAFT

HONOLULU HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

Section 106 Consultation – SHPD

SHPD Offices, Kapolei
11:30 a.m. June 19, 2008

Attendees: Lawrence Spurgeon, Stephanie Roberts, Susan Robbins, Ann Yoklavich, Dennis Liverman, Astrid _____, Kate _____, Barry _____, Dennis Haskell

MR. Spurgeon stated that the project team will start bringing in forms in late July for SHPD staff to begin looking at eligibility. The information will be categorized by geography. The information will be for the First project and not the extensions at this time.

It was explained that for Pearl Harbor and Chinatown the guideway will be elevated. It was also explained that there will be some 106 impacts and also Section 4(f) considerations. Regarding the Pearl Harbor, the avoidance alternative to Pearl Harbor is essentially the Salt Lake alternative. However, both the Salt Lake and Airport alignments are still viable at this time.

Discussed meeting with National Park Service (NPS) who did not state a preface to if there was an adverse or not adverse effect on Pearl Harbor. One issue is the Makalapa gate area. Mr. Spurgeon showed plan maps from both the current project and also the 1992 project to show that the proposed guideway does not vary much and is essentially the same design. There was a question as to the Chapel if it was separate or part of the existing landmark and therefore a separate nomination. Another question as to Anti Terrorist Force regulations was raised as to the fencing placement for the proposed station and how much that would encroach onto the Pearl Harbor property.

The probability of finding archaeological finds was discussed. It was stated by the project team that the possibility of pre contact findings was low; however, the possibility of post contact findings was probable.

It was stated by SHPD that the National Trust would like information about the project. It was agreed that information would be sent to them.

SHPD had concerns regarding stations and their appearance. It was stated that all stations would be the same to a point; but could be aesthetically different based upon the context of where it is located. Differences could be canopies, entrance points, and artwork in stations.

A question was raised by SHPD regarding a small cemetery Diamond Head of Pearl harbor and if testing will be done. SHPD was told that testing will be done and that the project does not expect to hit the cemetery.

Regarding Chinatown SHPD was told that there are not expected to be any buildings that need to be taken; however, there is a parking lot where a station touch-down at the Chinatown station will be that will be impacted. Also, the downtown station near the Dillingham building has been moved.

Mr. Spurgeon explained the decision of steel on steel technology has been made and that construction vibration analysis will be done for the project, but no operating vibration issues would occur. Regarding noise there will be a parapet wall along the length of the guideway. In addition, the potential construction methods for columns was discussed and the differences between the two.