MINUTES
HAWAII HISTORIC PLACES REVIEW BOARD Meeting

DATE: SATURDAY, November 22, 2014
TIME: 9:30 a.m.
PLACE: Kalanikou Building
1151 Punchbowl Street Room 132
Honolulu HI 96809

The following were in attendance:

MEMBERS: William Chapman
Jeff Dodge, AIA
Gary Nakatsuka
Laura Ruby
Gerald DeMello
Thomas Lim
Nancy Peacock, AIA
William Souza

ABSENT: George Casen

STAFF: Anna Broverman, Architectural Historian
Jessica Puff, Architectural Historian
Cicely Lorenzo-Ganir, Secretary III

GUESTS: Megan Borthwick
Milton I
Wendy Tolleson
Ross Stephenson
Coral Prince
Don Hibbard
Dan Purcell
Stanley Solamillo
Carol Stephenson

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by William Chapman at 9:35 a.m. Eight members were present.
II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

SHPD requested the Hawaii Historic Places Review Board (HHPRB) strike from the agenda the National Register Nominations for Kalauao Stream Bridge, Kalauao Springs Bridge, and Waimalu Bridge. The National Register Nomination preparer, HART Rail and the Federal Transportation Administration requested to withdraw them from consideration.

SHPD also requested HHPRB strike from the agenda the Executive Meeting vote and discussion with Dr. Alan Downer. Dr. Downer was not able to attend the meeting. SHPD requested to substitute the Executive Session with an overview of the HPRV policies and protocol, and an update about the National and State Register programs for the newly appointed review board members. The presentations were made by Jessica Puff and Anna Broverman.

**ACTION:** A motion was made by Jeff Dodge to approve the amended November 22, 2014, agenda, seconded by Gerald DeMello.

**VOTE:** The Board members voted unanimously to approve the amended November 22, 2014, agenda. Motion carries.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Chapman called for the approval of the 23 August 2014, Hawaii Historic Places Review Board (HHPRB) Meeting Minutes.

**ACTION:** A motion was made by William Souza to correct typos and approve the August 23, 2014, minutes, seconded by Gerald DeMello.

**VOTE:** The Board members voted unanimously to approve the August 23, 2014, minutes after corrections are made. Motion carries.

IV. NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS and HISTORIC PLACES REVIEW BOARD OVERVIEW

SHPD mentioned meeting format changes:
- Reminded the board members to comply with Sunshine Law protocol. At site visits, board members should not converse with one another about the site. Comments from all board members should be documented in the meeting minutes.

Per Dr. Downer:
- Review board members are encouraged to read all the nomination paperwork.
- He wanted to remind the members that the site visit is not to complete nomination paperwork that is lacking.
- The HHPRB is voting only on the nomination paperwork.

Member Nancy Peacock commented that for Criteria C relating to the integrity and the period of significance, seeing the building in person has proven very insightful. She is able to discern with her own eyes the integrity of the neighborhood and the integrity of the work.

Staff member Jessica Puff questioned the appropriateness of the site visit if it is being used to justify the property and approve an incomplete/lacking nomination form. She cited constrained resources and running a number of important programs that need a lot of time.

Member Gerald DeMello, being the only member from the neighbor island, stated that the site visits are necessary. As a sociologist, he uses the site visit to get additional information. He is unfamiliar with Oahu. He urged the SHPD staff to think about their priorities. DeMello also would have appreciated Dr. Downer, being at this meeting.

Chair Chapman commented that if a nomination does not convey everything, the Review Board is not seeing the property at the National Register level. If on a site visit, they notice that something is missing, the nomination needs to be changed. Puff added that no other state Review Board conducts site visits; No other state runs their Review Board like Hawaii does.

Guest Ross Stephenson objected to what Puff had to say. He worked at SHPD for 5 years, stating that the nomination process took hours and hours of his time. He also thought that was what a State office is supposed to do. Stephenson’s job was federally-funded, so he thinks that SHPD needs to be pro-active with the nominations.

Puff clarified that she is talking about the State Register; Stephenson is talking about the National Register. Staff member Anna Broverman will be talking about the difference between the State Register and the National Register. According to State rules, SHPD is not allowed to hold back and comment on the nomination. However, for the National Register, it is okay to hold back nominations.

** New Review Board members who took their Oaths of Office (appointed and confirmed) were welcomed, and joined the table (Ruby and Nakatsuka). **

Puff noted there will be a full Review Board when two additional members are confirmed.

Puff reiterated that SHPD should be contacted for questions relating to the Review Board, National Register, and State Register. The Review Board does not represent SHPD. SHPD does not want the Review Board member to get caught up in a conflict/situation with a third-party. The Review Board needs to remain independent and in an advisory capacity.
Peacock brought up that she is contacted by people needing help preparing their nominations. Although she is asked to be a consultant, because she is a board member, she cites a conflict of interest and declines the work.

Guest Wendy Tolleson inquired about the best way to contact SHPD staff members. She noted past telephone calls to voicemails that were full, sending emails, and a receptionist that did not know how to transfer calls.

Broverman explained the difference between the State Register and the National Register.

The State Register follows the State Law for the nomination that includes: (1) the National Register form, (2) photos, and (3) map. A meeting is scheduled for reviewing the nomination.

The National Register process looks for the completeness of the nomination that is then forwarded to the National Park Service.

Chair Chapman noted the shift in the last five years. The National Register is more of an overarching planning tool; the State Register is a lower-level recognition that provides special tax incentives. Chair Chapman wants to improve the number of National Register nominations.

Member Laura Ruby inquired about SHPD staff reviewing a nomination, then finding the property not eligible after going through the whole process. She asked if SHPD goes over everything with the nominator. She stated that the corrections should not be with the Review Board. Broverman stated that SHPD has no power over this. DeMello suggested rewriting the Administrative Rules. Puff explained that changes can be recommended, then they go to the Branch Chiefs, then the Administrator, and finally out to public comment for changes or additions. Stephenson, citing his years at SHPD, thinks the whole process does not have to be an official rule change. Chair Chapman understands what Puff and Stephenson are saying. Chapman notes that most time those who submit nominations know the process. Guest member Megan Borthwick of Hawaii Historic Foundation (HHF) mentioned that HHF can help the public with the process to determine their eligibility. They are free, people can call, and they take walk-ins.

Puff reminded the members about the Sunshine Law while on site visits. Puff recommends a maximum of two members and one other non-partial be present at the site visits. The State of Hawaii: Hawaii State Ethics Commission is being very critical of Boards.

DeMello suggested inviting the Ethics Commission to a Review Board meeting so they understand what the Board needs to do. Puff mentioned that the Ethics Commission is unable to speak to the members on the weekends. She might recommend a weekday meeting so that the Ethics Commission and the Attorney Generals can also attend.

Puff also clarified that according to ethics, when a member recuses themselves because of participation in a project, that member needs to also step out of the room during the presentation and until voting is done.
ACTION: Recess was called by Chair William Chapman at 10:20 a.m.

ACTION: Chair Chapman reconvened the meeting at 12:33 p.m.

Introductions of the Review Board members took place.
Gary Nakatsuka – Architect (Mitsunaga and Associates); 1st time Review Board member
Laura Ruby – Local Historian
William Souza – Hawaiian Cultural Specialist; Vice-Chair of the HHPRB
Nancy Peacock – Architect; 3rd term on the HHPRB
William Chapman – Anthropologist and Historian; Chair of the HHPRB
Jeffrey Dodge – Architect (Pearl Harbor)
Gerald DeMello – Sociologist; works at the UH Hilo College of Pharmacy
Thomas Lim – Architect; Former SHPD Architecture Branch Chief

V. STAFF REPORTS
A. Staff Changes
Anna Broverman, Architecture Historian: will run the Certified Local Government (CLG) program and the Section 106 Program. She is a graduate of Columbia University.

Jessica Puff, Architectural Historian: will work on Federal 106 and Federal Tax Credits. She came from the Michigan State Preservation Office, and is familiar with Section 106 work for HUD (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development)-related projects, Federal tax credits, and worked on the Michigan Modern Project.

Mike Gushard, former Acting Architecture Branch Chief, is now at the Oregon SHPO

Deona Nona Naboa, Archaeologist, is now at the Department of Transportation

Burial Sites Specialists:
Regina Hilo – Oahu
Herbert Poepoe – Hilo
Jordan Calpito – Maui

B. Hawaii Island Certified Local Government - August
C. Chapter 6E List of Projects that do not have the potential to cause Adverse Impacts to historic resources
The draft list is available on the website. Comments were accepted until the end of November 2014.
D. Archaeology Day
Various activities were planned and happened on various islands. On Kauai, Mary Jane Naone held two walks. On Maui, Jenny Pickett held a site visit and walking tour, along with an open house of the Maui office. Mike Vitousek, in Kona, had site visits and a walk. On Oahu, there was an open house for the Kapolei office.

Stephenson mentioned that there is also a Historic Preservation Day that will be at the State Capitol in May 2015.

Anyone interested in any input or programs for Historic Preservation Day should contact Jessica Puff.

E. Federal Historic Tax Credit Annual Report
Puff provided copies to the members.

F. National Park Service Biennial Meeting
Sept. 25, 2014 at NOAA on Ford Island

Honouliuli Gulch Environmental Assessment Final Draft is expected December 2014/January 2015. The National Park Service paid for the Environmental Assessment. It will be a new National Park. There is concern about making it a National Historic Landmark (eligible). Monsanto donated the land.

Per Puff, there are less than 20 National Historic Landmarks on Oahu.

G. Old Pahoa Village Historic District Lava Flow – Survey
Puff photographed every building (1-2 good photographs for each). Pahoa is not formally a district on the State Register. It has preliminary documentation maps. An informal Reconnaissance Level Survey (RLS) of each was completed.

H. National Park Service Corrective Action Plan Update
The Final CAP was submitted at the beginning of 2014. It was accepted in June 2014. The only exception is the database because of funding. Also, SHPD is in the final stages of the audit being conducted by a separate firm. It should be finalized in December 2014. A report is expected by the beginning of 2015, and it will identify items that need to be corrected. It will also look at how SHPD spent its time and money.

VI. 2014 SURVEY AND INVENTORY
A. Old Pahoa Village – Not complete/Pending
B. Fisherman’s Wharf – Intensive Level Survey (ILS) Accepted
C. **Hawaii Army National Guard: Historic Building Survey and Evaluation Report at Six Facilities** – Not accepted; SHPD will let the members know when the Final is in.

D. **2013 Statewide Bridge Survey** – Accepted  
Peacock commented about not being able to get perspective on the bridges when they were presented two meetings ago. The Board wanted to see all the bridges to evaluate which ones are more historic. Puff clarified that the Board should be looking for historic and individual significance; some may have integrity but are not individually eligible. Chair Chapman thought that each individual bridge can be eligible. Guest Don Hibbard agreed.

E. **Hale Ilima** – ILS Accepted – Not complete

F. **Wahiawa Historic Reconnaissance Level Survey (RLS)** – Accepted; SHPD had comments. The report should be amended in the future.

### VII. NOMINATIONS

1. **City and County of Honolulu**

   **Name:** Milton I Residence  
   **Address:** 4339 Papu Circle, Honolulu, HI  
   **Presenter:** Don Hibbard

   Don Hibbard presented this residence. The kitchen has been remodeled. There is one alteration in the front of the house.

   Puff and Broverman did not present/prepare any photos.

   Peacock had a print out of colored photos. Ruby had photos on her laptop.

   Lim was very impressed with the “open” residence.

   DeMello will provide commentary later.

   Dodge had a hard time distinguishing the different additions to the residence.

   Peacock asked if Onodera’s original drawings were available. Hibbard was unable to find original drawings. Peacock thought original drawings and documents would have helped because she had a hard time differentiating between what was added and what was original. Chair Chapman reminded Peacock that her comments were more appropriate for the discussion part to follow.
Souza was curious about the remnants on the property that link it to its military history. Hibbard noted that the tool shed on the property is on a concrete foundation that was used by the military.

Guest Tolleson added that the concrete box on the property used by the military for their search light. During World War I, it was used as a part of the U.S. coastal defense strategy. Dodge thought they were used for anti-aircraft guns.

Ruby was also interested in the military aspect of the property. She thought a map of what was used by the military, such as the stone walls and other features, should be included in the nomination.

Nakatsuka was very impressed with the site. He also found it difficult to separate what was a renovation and what was original in the residence. He added that any drawings would help with the nomination.

**Action:** A motion was made to nominate the property to the State Register by William Souza. Seconded by Thomas Lim.

Puff clarified that the nomination was not in the proper form – it needs to be on disc. Also, a map and photos needed to be added to send the nomination up to the National Register.

Peacock thought the open-air design (mentioned in the nomination) that made the residence most distinctive had lost its integrity when screens were added. She didn’t think it was “readable.” The criteria that made it “most unique” was no longer there. Hibbard added that modern living does not allow for open air like in the past. It is not secure. He felt that the sliding doors offered a compromise between open-air and security. Hibbard still thinks this residence is a good example of Kenji Onodera’s work. Peacock thought the interface between old and new was not distinguishable. Hibbard added that everything from the living room back is Onodera’s. She thought Don Hibbard’s hand-sketch was hard to see.

DeMello took on a historical/sociological view. He thought the front addition did not detract from the entirety. He also found it hard to distinguish old from new. He thought the distinctiveness inside the residence reflected that period in Hawaii (1950s) well. He saw the open-air design as well as the functionality of the screens. He liked the military walls, but felt that they should be more positively noted in the nomination write-up. He thought the utilization of the concrete military foundation was a nice complement.

Ruby added about the layering of military remnants. She mentioned that at the last review board meeting, there were concerns about the property being available to the public. Hibbard added that the County has provisions for that; opening the gate once a month to
invite people to view from the walkway. Ruby thought the interior was gracious and inviting.

Souza liked the residence and thought it showed as aspect of island living that you don’t see very much. He thought the house had a great “island feel” and a “komo mai” genre. When asked by Souza, Mr. I mentioned whom he had entertained at his house. These include: Jacqueline Kennedy, Caroline Kennedy, John John Kennedy, Crown Prince Akihito, the High Chief of Samoa, Marilyn Monroe, Former Governor Waihee, Former Governor Cayetano, Jim Nabors, Former Governor of Hawaii John Burns.

Dodge thought this was a very interesting and unique house. There is a lot of history associated with this residence that did not get into the nomination that would have made it acceptable to include on the State Register at this time. He thought that more explanation, especially in dividing the areas of the home up, would be helpful. He questioned the later layers that blocked the openness and blocked the integrity.

Hibbard commented on the more modern facade. The garage has a unit above it now that is an intrusion on the house. However the original design and intent is there.

Dodge thought that a person reading the nomination would find it hard to understand the property. It was hard to see the distinction and evolution in the nomination. He suggested including some magazine photos from the articles the house has been featured in be added to the nomination. According to Mr. I, the house has been featured in three magazines.

Nakatsuka read the narrative/nomination. It was only after the site visit that he truly enjoyed Mr. I and the property right down to the bricks. It was very different from what he had read on paper. He questioned how that history could be put into the nomination. He supported provisions for people to walk through the property as long as Mr. I is the guide.

DeMello thought there was opportunity for more history (Criteria A). He inquired about the landscape architecture and the interior garden, and if there are other houses on the street like it. According Mr. I, his house is the only one. Mr. I added that the house starts at the front gate.

Chair Chapman, Ruby, and DeMello thought the history on the nomination could be enriched, and are asking for more detail in the file. Ruby suggested sub-headings that would make it easier for people to read the nomination.

Chair Chapman inquired if SHPD had suggestions. Puff clarified that the Review Board has two options: (1) They can pass the motion with recommended revisions that are minor in nature; or, (2) they do not pass the motion based upon revisions that require extensive work.
Guest Purcell reminded Chair Chapman that as a member of the public, he can comment on every agenda. Although Chair Chapman approved the agenda, notice was not adequate on the agenda; there was no address, no information on where this residence is. He also noted that the bridges are still on the published agenda on the State’s on-line calendar, even though those items have been “withdrawn.”

Puff clarified that at the start of the meeting at 9:30 a.m., an official request was made to amend the agenda, and to remove the three bridges from the agenda, as well as to remove the Executive Session with Dr. Downer. The Review Board approved the removal.

Purcell questioned the “Executive Meeting Vote” noted on the official agenda on file at the Lt. Governor’s office. Chair Chapman added that he approved the new agenda. It was made clear that the Review Board did not go into Executive Session.

Souza acknowledged that Purcell has legitimate questions, and suggested referring Purcell to SHPD staff that prepared the agenda. Purcell added that the Chairperson of the Review Board is responsible for the agenda. Souza felt that this interaction is making it impossible for the Review Board to do its work. Purcell mentioned filing a complaint. Chair Chapman will be careful about the way to deal with the agenda, such as listing the address, etc. Ruby suggested deferring to the next meeting. Peacock asked about amending the motion. Chair Chapman appreciated Purcell’s input. Chair Chapman and Souza have no intent to deceive the public or hide anything. Chair Chapman and Souza will make sure the complete addresses are included, and will tighten up the procedure on the agenda.

**Action:** William Souza retracted his earlier motion.

**Action:** William Souza made a motion to defer (Peacock added “defer the vote”) to collect more information to be aware of the total picture; and asked that the nomination be forwarded to the State Register under Criteria A and C, (Hibbard added “place on the Register with enrichment and more information) with more clarification and added enrichment. Seconded by Laura Ruby.

Ruby commented that Criteria A: Events in history, the social picture from 1955 onwards, and the military history, even archaeological history, should be added to the nomination in subheadings. She also thought historical photos should be added.

Tolleson added that the National Guard has photographs and maps that can go into the nomination.

Stephenson noted that in the past, conditional approval goes to the Chairperson for acceptance.
Puff clarified that if the review board passes the motion to list the property on the State register, SHPD will finalize the listing if the Review Board votes to approve. Then, after Mr. I provides the requested information to SHPD, the Review Board will not have to review the property again.

**Vote:** 6 in favor (Lim, DeMello, Dodge, Souza, Ruby, Nakatsuka) – 2 opposed (Chapman, Peacock)

**Criteria:** A & C

**Level of Significance:** Local

Name: Mother Waldron Playground – Nomination Update
Presenter: Jessica Puff

Stanley Solamillo will not be presenting. Puff presented this nomination.

This item on the agenda is an amendment to the existing nomination; it is to enrich the nomination. The nomination reflects the comments that were submitted. There are a few changes and alterations.

Stephenson added that alterations are to the mauka end of the park; the boundary was cut off at the mauka end due to road alignment.

Souza inquired about current photos of the park.

Hibbard said the road alignment was done in the 1990s; and this revises the nomination.

Lim talked about restoration of the park.

Stephenson noted that the building on the right is the Department of Education’s.

Tolleson and Ruby inquired about burials. Puff clarified that SHPD internal documentation identifies the burials located during the HART rail project. She is unable to point out the burial in a public forum.

SHPD recommends this re-nomination to the State Register and the National Register. It is a complete nomination.
**Action:** A motion was made to list the property on the State Register, with recommendation to the National Register under Criteria A and C, by Nancy Peacock. Seconded by William Souza.

Souza asked if this was the only public park in the future city area.

Puff reiterated that this nomination was a goal of the HART rail redevelopment project. The programmatic agreement calls for restoration and improvements to Mother Waldron Park and Irwin Park. The changes have not been solidified yet. A committee made up of stakeholders has been formed and will review the changes.

Lim has attended HCDA meetings for the area. There are breakdowns for requirements such as green space, park space. The discussions are ongoing.

Puff stated that the nomination will inform the stakeholder committee about the new boundaries for the site. They will then use the new boundaries to do their work.

Ruby asked if the boundaries could be expanded. Chair Chapman and Puff clarified that the boundaries cannot be expanded, and that the boundaries are pre-proposed in the National Register nomination.

Dodge inquired about the original road, and if the nomination included the road. Puff clarified that the road is a non-contributing feature to the park.

Peacock asked about the original nomination that went to the Review Board in the 1980s.

Chair Chapman added that the new boundary cut off at the new street level.

Puff noted that the nomination will be corrected to state the boundary of the park, and what was once the street is now non-contributing green space.

Chair Chapman added that the final nomination should show the limits of the mauka end.

Puff showed the historic boundary compared to the new boundary. The new boundary is the dashed line on the photo.

DeMello added that SHPD knows the completed nomination, and elements that are character-defining should be added. Puff will clarify the nomination to make the boundaries confirm that the green space that was once road and the old neighborhood is not part of the nomination.

Guest Purcell was concerned that the Mother Waldron “Update” is not an action item, therefore the Review Board cannot take action. Chair Chapman agrees that this item needs more clarification.
**Action:** Nancy Peacock withdrew her earlier motion.

Puff clarified that SHPD Administrator, Dr. Downer has not certified the nomination. He will not certify the nomination until it is approved by the Review Board. Paul Lusignan (NPS) reviewed the nomination as a courtesy/pre-approval to have the Review Board vote on it. It is not an official listing. The nomination has to be voted on by the Review Board, then be certified and submitted. Chair Chapman added that it is more of an update of the nomination.

Purcell noted that Kakaako is on the forefront of many peoples’ minds including the Governor Elect Ige. He also noted that this agenda item was inadequately noticed. He felt this item is important because it is in the heart of Kakaako.

**Action:** Nancy Peacock withdrew her motion again.

**Moved for Deferment:** Jeffrey Dodge  
**Seconded:** Gerald De Mello  
**Vote:** 8 in favor (Lim, DeMello, Dodge, Chapman, Peacock, Souza, Ruby, Nakatsuka) – 0 opposed  
**Criteria:** A & C  
**Level of Significance:** Local

Name: **Gouveia Residence, 2134 Metcalf Street, Honolulu, HI**  
Presenter: Don Hibbard

Guest Tolleson was curious about period of significance.

Guest Stephenson thought this residence was an excellent candidate because it was intact. It reflects the various building elements.

De Mello thought the stone structure and the concrete was significant.

Peacock recognized the small and significant improvements to the site such as the small split concrete driveway and the simple back. Even the fruit tree added to the integrity. She thought the whole property was period pure.

**Moved for Approval:** Gerald DeMello  
**Seconded:** Laura Ruby
Vote: 8 in favor (Lim, DeMello, Dodge, Chapman, Peacock, Souza, Ruby, Nakatsuka) – 0 opposed

Criteria: C

Level of Significance: Local

DeMello commented on the significance of the dwelling coupled with the whole property.

Guest Purcell noted that the complete address of the property is not noted on the agenda.

Peacock appreciated the small residence. She was wowed by the wall that was still standing.

Chair Chapman commended the owner on the details such as the floors and the cabinets.

VIII. CITIZENS’ CONCERNS– Jessica Puff

A. National Register Nomination Status

1. Moiliili Japanese Cemetery
   Puff will track down the version submitted to Mike Gushard before he left. Member Ruby will forward a copy to Puff. Then Puff will forward it to Paul Lusignan at NPS.

2. Ewa Battlefield
   SHPD will review and make comments.
   Stephenson added that this is part of the American Battlefield Commission Grant for a World War II battlefield.

3. Lanai City
   This nomination was postponed because the owner had a disagreement about the boundaries. Stanley Solamillo wrote the nomination, but at the last minute the new owner opposed it. There have been suggestions to talk with the new owner to see their position. Broverman met with the Maui County Council about the Maui Community Plan. They proposed strategies for listing it on the National Register.
   Puff wanted to clarify and perfect the state nomination process. Puff has 60 days to comment from the date of receipt.

Chair Chapman thought that using the National Register form follows the National Register policy. Then in turn, the State Register policy will reflect the National Register policy.
Puff notes that the draft goes to the Board to rule and approve.

IX. Historic District Study Committee Reports
    N/A

X. Appeals/Annual Resolutions
    N/A

XI. Date of Next Meeting
    February 21, 2015

XII. ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: A motion was made by Nancy Peacock to adjourn the meeting, seconded by William Souza.

VOTE: The Board members voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting. Motion carries.

The meeting adjourned at 3:11 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cicely Lorenzo-Ganir
Secretary III
State Historic Preservation Division