


LINDA LINGLE
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION
601 KAMOKILA BOULEVARD, ROOM 555
KAPOLEI, HAWAII 96707

ALLAN A. SMITH
INTERIM CHAIRPERSON
BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

PETER T. YOUNG
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

KEN C. KAWAHARA
DEPUTY DIRECTOR - WATER

AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND OCEAN RECREATION
BUREAU OF CONVEYANCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
CONSERVATION AND COASTAL LANDS
CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT
ENGINEERING
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
KAHOOLAWE ISLAND RESERVE COMMISSION
LAND
STATE PARKS

MINUTES

HAWAII HISTORIC PLACES REVIEW BOARD MEETING

DATE: March 3, 2007
TIME: 2:30 p.m.
PLACE: The Kona Outdoor Circle Foundation
76-6280 Kuakini Highway
Kailua-Kona, Hawaii 96740

Review Board Present:

Dr. Kiyoshi Ikeda
Virginia Murison
Michiko Kodama-Nishimoto
Kenneth Hays

Joyce Chinen
James Guequirre
William Souza
Peter Mills

Staff Present: Jocelyn Nazareno, Katie Kastner and Melanie Chinen

Guests in Attendance: Pamela Burns, Irving Jenkins, Barbara Shideler (AIA, Mason Architects), Leilani S. Hino(Mauna Lani Resort), Ming-Yi Wong,(Mason Architects), MaryAnne Maigret (DLNR State Parks Division), Ena Estes (Daughters of Hawaii), Fannie Auhooy (Daughters of Hawaii).

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Kiyoshi Ikeda, Chairperson called the Hawaii Historic Places Review Board meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

The board members and SHPD staff members in attendance introduced themselves. Dr. Ikeda asked the public to introduce themselves. Members of the public introduced themselves to the Board.

1. Approval of Meetings for 26, 2006

Dr. Ikeda asked if the members of the board had any comments or changes regarding the August 26, 2006 minutes. There were no comments from the board members. The board unanimously approved the minutes for the August 26, 2006 Review Board Meeting.

II. EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURES FOR THE MEETING

Dr. Ikeda explained that a board member must first nominate a nomination, this nomination must be seconded by another board member. There will then be an opportunity for discussion, first by the board members and then by the public.

Dr. Ikeda explained that the Tomikawa store nomination will be last on the agenda, and the Hulihee Palace nomination will be third.

III. SITE REVIEW

1. Puako Petroglyph Archaeological District Boundary Change

Peter Mills moved to place the Puako Petroglyph Archaeological District Boundary Change on the Hawaii Register and to recommend nomination to the National Register. William Souza seconded the motion.

Leilani Hino gave a presentation on the Puako Petroglyph Archaeological District to the board. She displayed a map showing the current boundaries for the district. She explained that in 1990 it was discovered that some of the petroglyphs found in 1964 had been erroneously located.

Dr. Ikeda asked that Ms. Hino explain what a petroglyph is for the members of the public. She explained that they are pictographs inscribed in stone and that the Puako petroglyphs are located in the state parcel adjacent to Mauna Lani Property. This land is under lease to the Mauna Lani who agreed to care for them.

Ms. Hino explained that ten years after the district was listed it was discovered that the boundaries were not recorded properly and that SHPD suggested that the boundaries be changed to accurately define the area described in the nomination.

Ms. Hino thanked Mary Ann Maigret for her work in confirming that the boundaries were incorrectly recorded when Ms. Maigret worked at SHPD.

Ms. Hino asked if the board had any questions.

Mr. Souza asked if all the parties involved are happy with the outcome.

Ms. Hino stated all of the parties are very happy with the outcome.

Mr. Guequirre asked if they are part of any tourist cultural program where people can access them.

Ms. Hino said that only a small portion of petroglyphs in Kaaeo A field has access allowed to it, but not to the rest of it because preservation and research are what the focus is on.

Mr. Guequirre asked if the Mauna Lani will care for the petroglyphs.

Ms. Hino said that the Mauna Lani has been caring for the petroglyphs since 1982 and that they have done a good job.

Ms. Murison asked what will be the impact on the land not to be included, and if they have done research to ensure that there are not petroglyphs in this area.

Ms. Hino commented that they have done research to confirm that there are not any petroglyphs in the area. Bob Wolforth has conducted a study and completed a report to this effect.

Mr. Souza asked if the public will have access to these petroglyphs.

Ms. Hino responded that they will only have access to the main portion to which they have always been allowed access, but not to the rest of the site.

Peter Mills requested that Bill Bonk's, former professor of UH Hilo, work be added to the nomination, as he may have some pertinent information on the site. He asked if anyone had talked to him.

Ms. Hino says that she knows Mr. Bonk and that he has not mentioned anything to her, but that she will mention it to Mauna Lani.

Dr. Ikeda asked if there were anymore questions. No one had anymore questions.

The board voted unanimously to place the Puako Petroglyph Archaeological District boundary change on the Hawaii Register and to recommend nomination to the National Register.

Ms. Hino thanked the board for their vote.

Mr. Hays and Dr. Ikeda both extended their gratitude to Ms. Hino for her presentation.

2. Tantalus Drive – Round Top Road

Dr. Ikeda asked for a nomination of this site to the Hawaii Register.

Michiko Kodama-Nishimoto moved to place the Tantalus Drive – Round Top Road on the Hawaii Register and to recommend nomination to the National Register. Virginia Murison seconded the motion.

Dr. Ikeda asked if someone was representing the Tantalus Drive-Round Top Road. Barbara Shideler of Mason Architects said that she would be happy to answer any questions regarding the nomination.

Mr. Hays said that he has quite a few questions and asked if this is a historic landscape that is being nominated.

Ms. Shideler said that it could be called that.

Mr. Hays said that the form does not give you all of the clear options to check off that they should, and it is true that a landscape should be reported as a site. Mr. Hays had questions about the features of the site and said that he thinks that it would be extremely advantageous to have a full blown cultural landscape report and then to draw from that for the nomination. He said that there need to be more information about what view planes in the area are important to maintain and what plants in the area are considered essential for the historic landscape, and what are the character defining features of the road itself that you would like to preserve. The lava rock walls, the masonry etc.

Ms. Shideler commented that they did not do a cultural landscape assessment because the plantings outside the road right of way, but they do contribute to the overall feeling. She said that she recognizes the need to define the view planes and that she will do a description update, possibly with a diagram showing the view planes.

Mr. Hays asked in regard to the roadway, what aspects of it are important to be maintained what type of paving is important to maintain.

Ms. Shideler said that it would be the asphalt and that the last layer of asphalt was done in the 1950.

Mr. Hays continued that on the Boundary description on page four it says the boundary encompasses but does not exceed all of property that has been historically associated with Tantalus and Round Top Drive. He says that a lot of residences are mentioned that are adjoining the road, but that the nomination does not really say that the residences are contributing. He then asked Ms. Shideler if the residences are or are not contributing.

Barbara Shideler of Mason Architects testified that the residences are not part the physical boundary of the road. Ms. Shideler says that when she talks about the road she is talking about the actual physical right of way.

Mr. Hays suggests that some clearer verbiage be added to the nomination, as it might be helpful. Mr. Hays continues by asking about the origin of the Tantalus name.

Ms. Shideler said that they heard from residents it was a name given to Puu Kakea by Punahou students.

Mr. Hays asked, so it is not from Greek mythology.

Ms. Shideler answered that it was from Greek mythology.

Mr. Hays reiterates his opinion that cultural landscape report would be helpful

Mr. Mills comments that there are many roads in the state that have been around since 1800 or earlier. Mr. Mills comments that this is the first road that has been nominated to the register since he has been on the board. He continued that he has concerns regarding what are contributing and non-contributing elements to the road. He comments that what he thinks this is really a contributing element to a larger cultural landscape, but that by itself he sees very little reason why this road, given all other historic roads in the state, is particularly eligible. He asked Ms. Shideler what her justification is for nominating this road.

Ms. Shideler commented that there are other roads on the state on the register and one of them, the Kuhio Highway, is on the National Register, the other road on the state register is the Hanalei Road. She states that she was personally involved with both of those nominations and that she used a very similar format for this one. She added that Tantalus is unique because it is such an unaltered rural landscape in a primary urban core, and that there is nothing else that compares to it anywhere in the state. For such a heavily urbanized area to have such a rural resource is unique.

Mr. Mills said that he still agrees with Mr. Hays. He asked if a construction crew came through right now and decided to do something to change the road what would be considered important. For example, if they were putting in utility lines and need to rip out cobblestones under the road are we considering those cobblestones contributing elements that merit preservation in place? He said there are certain issues that need to be addressed if this is going to be used as a management document for the road itself.

Dr. Ikeda said that we have placed one roadway on Kauai on the register and that this is not the first one.

Mr. Mills commented that it is the first one since he has been on the board.

Ms. Shideler said that the lava rock retaining wall and all the basalt curving is being lost through city initiated improvements. She continues to say that they have taken away this material in order to widen the road and they put in non-historic guardrails and barriers. Shideler states that she is fully in support of anything to strengthen the historic maintenance of the road, but that typically these sorts of things would go into a corridor management plan. There is some precedent for this as the State Prepared one for the Hanalei Road.

Dr. Ikeda asked if there are anymore questions.

Joyce Chinen asked about page eleven of the narrative where it says that the road was first paved in 1937 with federal funding from the Works Progress Administration and that its association with that part of Hawaii's history makes it significant. She hopes that that would be part of what would be included in the nomination and that it would strengthen the document if it was in the statement of significance.

Dr. Ikeda asked the board if there are anymore comments.

Mr. Souza asked if there is any idea how many of the plantings along the road are indigenous.

Ms. Shideler answers that there is a section along the top of the road near Manoa-Fitz Rd. that has a lot of indigenous Hawaiian plantings. That neighborhood, in the late 19th and early 20th century looted for sandalwood and various building materials and then was later on reforested and returned to its original character. This area is not adjacent to the road. The whole Makiki area is very important to Oahu, hopefully at sometime a more extensive study is done on this area.

Mr. Souza asks if Ms. Shideler would say that this area is similar to Nuuanu Drive in Nuuanu.

Ms. Shideler responds that she thinks that this area was like Nuuanu in the early 1950's but Nuuanu has been altered significantly.

Mr. Souza asks about the situation with the water, as the hill is a cinder cone that slides around if it is not vegetated and right now a lot of money is being put into repairing that road there.

Ms. Shideler says that this area is not part of the nomination and is below the area included in the nomination and that the nominated area stops at the watershed from the 1.5 or 2.5 to the 8.5 mile marker.

Mr. Souza says he is trying to look for something really historically connected, a lot of places in Honolulu are equally important. He says that he doesn't understand why Tantalus was given a foreign name in place of a Hawaiian name. He said it is probably worthy of preservation, but he is trying to find historical significance from his perspective. He asked if the road has ties to the monarchy.

(Audience member comments, can't hear the comments on tape)

Ms. Shideler says that the road does have monarchical ties there was land at the top that was owned by a member of the monarchy H.W. Schmidt owned the land at the top.

Dr. Ikeda said that he would like to add some historical notes to Tantalus-Round Top Drive. He continues as you drive up you first hit Papakulea, the families that lived up there were so happy to drive through, because Papakulea was a squatters colony. Then A.P. Ania allowed for Hawaiian Homelands to develop Papakulea. So historically this is very significant to the lack of attention to Hawaiian needs now if you drive up there Hawaiian Homelands is stuck in the middle of suburban homes. As you drive towards Makiki Heights you see that it represents a significant contribution to Hawaii because all of the factors that controlled the Hawaiian plantations lived in this area. On the left going up is where the Chinese that could not afford to live anywhere else lived in this area, so there is a history of the development of this road that is associated with the history of these people that lived there. The homestead portion is also significant in terms of its relationship with trying to maintain the beauty of this setting. I think that more information regarding these points would help.

Woman in audience comments that she lives on Tantalus and that there is no road like it anywhere in the state and that the city has been doing more work on it, and this road needs to be protected for the people that live there as well as the visitors.

Dr. Ikeda comments that there is a tension because of safety and engineering and a need for modern things.

Woman in audience comments that the scenic byways program may be something to consider for this road, and that Hawaii is one of two states that does not have this. It would allow for federal funding, and it is something important for the island to pursue.

Dr. Ikeda asked if there are anymore comments.

Mr. Mills comments that this is exactly what historic preservation should be about, but the question becomes how to go about it. The one thing he is looking for is exactly what is contributing. What exactly is alright to change? He would like to see some of that spelled out. He comments that Mauna Loa still has the original cobblestones from 1891.

Mr. Hays says that you can do a nomination like this without doing a cultural landscape report. He comments that in this nomination he feels that sometimes the verbiage is not quite there. The verbiage needs to be tweaked to make it stronger. He continues that he completely agrees with Ms. Shideler's argument for the nomination and that he wants the road to be protected.

Ms. Shideler asks if it is the description of the road that needs work.

Mr. Hays answers that she should put at the end that the character defining features of the road are... there should be specific verbiage about what the nomination should protect.

Ms. Shideler comments that it is difficult because it is public property.

Mr. Hays comments that it would be helpful to have some residents write letters of support.

Ms. Shideler responds that they have had letters from residents in support.

Michiko Kodama-Nishimoto commented that the nomination was well written, but was more focused upon the things that surrounded the road and not the road itself. The nomination needs more emphasis on the road, what is it about the road itself, what characteristics make the road important?

Ms. Shideler comments that it is all there in the nomination.

Ms. Kodama says that Ms. Shideler mentioned something about another nomination for that area.

Ms. Shideler said there may be a multi-property nomination for Tantalus in the future.

Ms. Kodama comments that she looks forward to that.

Dr. Ikeda comments that he feels the board is ready for action. He asks for all those in favor of the nomination to say "aye."

Members respond "aye."

Dr. Ikeda asks for those opposed to say “nay.” Dr. Ikeda asks if anyone abstains.

Mr. Hays comments that he is abstaining. He says that he supports the nomination, but he feels that they need do more work.

Other board members concur with Mr. Hays.

Melanie Chinen commented to Dr. Ikeda that he has already made a motion to place it on the state register and suggests that he follow up with a second motion to help Barbara out with very specific concrete recommendations based on the board’s comments. Melanie Chinen recommends that she strong recommends that he keep the first motion in order to give the property some level of protection and give very specific recommendations of what the board wants.

Dr. Ikeda asked Melanie Chinen if she would like those recommendations now or if Katie can put it together.

Melanie Chinen commented that these are the boards concerns and that they are the ones that approve it.

Mr. Mills asked if the board could nominate a property to the state register contingent upon the following, saying we are nominating it, but we need the following things.

Melanie Chinen answered that you either vote for it to be on or you withdrawal your actions and totally reject it.

Ms. Kodama asked if the board could defer on the matter.

Dr. Ikeda said that he would like to withdraw the motion.

Ms. Kodama said that she would like to move to withdraw the initial motion.

Mr. Hays seconded the motion.

Dr. Ikeda asked for discussion.

Mr. Hays asked if there is a pressing issue why this needs to be on right away.

Ms Shideler responded that, yes, city crews are up on the road planning something, but she is not sure exactly what that is.

Ikeda asked for a vote

Joyce Chinen moved that the board nominate the property to the state register and recommend it to the national register contingent upon having the information about the WPA in the narrative, and more information about the character defining features.

Dr. Ikeda asked for other conditions.

Michiko seconded.

Dr. Ikeda asked for a vote.

Melanie Chinen commented that she was trying to explain to him that if you accept the nomination you accept the paperwork submitted today and you cannot accept it contingent upon them doing something else.

Dr. Ikeda asked if the board has to defer it.

Melanie Chinen responded that they can either defer or accept it. You can go back and amend it later, but if they chose not to amend it it will be listed as it is. The only power you would have to change it is to go through a delisting process.

Dr. Ikeda said that the board has not yet acted on the motion.

Dr. Ikeda asked if we can withdraw this motion and have a motion to defer with the same conditions.

The board asked for more discussion.

Mr. Mills commented that we have pointed out things that we would like to have added to nominations before and still voted to have them listed on the register.

Melanie Chinen commented that if the nomination is not updated then the board would have no recourse.

Mr. Mills commented that in these cases they did not delist the old one.

Melanie Chinen commented that that is what she was saying. You can go ahead with your first motion and allow someone the opportunity to come forward and amend it, knowing that you do have concerns.

Mr. Mills commented that that was the intent. We support it on the register, and we expect that the will follow through with this additional information.

Melanie Chinen commented that that is fine, but the board should be aware that there is no power behind that.

Ms. Kodama asked if the board can amend the motion so that they accept the nomination with a recommendation that they submit the additional information.

Melanie Chinen strongly encouraged the board to be very specific as to what their recommendations are because Barbara will go back and look at these, and some of the discussion was not very concrete as to what is wanted.

Ms. Kodama commented that she thinks that Barbara understands what the board wants.

Dr. Ikeda asked again for the statement as to what we are voting on.

Joyce Chinen nominated Tantalus-Round Top Road to the state register and recommends it to the national with the recommendation that the WPA section, and the character defining features be strengthened.

Ms. Kodama seconded the nomination.

Mr. Souza asked what happens now, because if we pass this it goes on the register. He asked what they will do next.

Dr. Ikeda asked for the vote.

Board members voted unanimously to place the Tantalus Drive – Round Top on the Hawaii Register and to recommend nomination to the National Register with recommendations be added to the nomination.

Joyce Chinen commented that those are recommendations not conditions

3. Hulihee Palace (Amend Nomination to Raise Level of Significance to National Significance)

Dr. Ikeda says that the next item on the agenda is to raise the level of significance of Hulihee Palace from state to national significance.

Mr. Irving Jenkins starts to make a comment.

Dr. Ikeda tells him that someone has to nominate the property and then he can speak.

William Souza moved to raise the level of significance for Hulihee Palace to the level of National Significance. Peter Mills seconded.

Mr. Irving Jenkins states that he is a Kalabash cousin of the Daughters of Hawaii and that they have asked him to represent them at the meeting. He recommends that the last sentence of the third paragraph be deleted. He says that the last paragraph is a political statement that does not represent the palace well, and that the last paragraph be deleted and that it is inflammatory and unnecessary.

Mr. Souza comments that this is interesting and comments on the term US occupation being used. He suggests that the nomination say “royal palace” instead of just “palace” as this could mean another type of palace such as a civic palace. He says that it should say that there are “three royal palace” and he reminds the Daughters that as a member of the Royal Order of Kamehameha that whenever they talk about their palace they should say “royal palace” because it becomes another entity that others want to use for their own purposes.

Katie Kastner comments that the reason we are trying to raise the level of significance for the palace, as we will be doing for other properties in the future, is to make these properties eligible for more funding. What we want to do is to make it possible for Hulihee Palace to seek federal grants which will allow them to repair the building. She continues that to be of national significance the property must be put in the context of the United States, so we cannot talk about it just within the context of Hawaii. She continues that this palace and Hawaii are very different from the rest of the United States, so to put it in a context of the United States we need to talk about colonization. That is the way that the nomination for Iolani Palace and Washington Palace discuss these sites. That is why we put it in this context. She continues to say that she spoke with the National Park Service and that this is the context that they suggested that we use. The amendment is meant to augment the existing nomination, it is not meant to replace anything in the existing nomination. The State Historic Preservation Office supports this nomination, and both the Administrator of the office and the Chairperson support this nomination.

Mr. Hays responds that the intent to amend this nomination is good, but that he thinks what would be best is a full blown National Historic Landmark application. The National office decides where you fit, and they will more than likely put you in the expansionism category. He thinks that Hulihee is one of the most incredible places in Hawaii and that they deserve to be listed for national significance. He continues that a full blown Landmark nomination done by the right people

Melanie Chinen comments that this would be a great long term goal, but that we are working with a time constraint of April for the grant. This would at least make them eligible. It is our intent to have them try to expedite this in Washington and to have our counterparts in California help us in supporting this as well.

Mr. Hays asks if she means that Washington has consented to listing this as an NHL.

Ms. Kastner explains that, no, this would be forwarded to Washington for consideration for national significance for the national register. This would make it eligible for Save America's Treasures.

Mr. Hays responds that he understands.

Melanie Chinen comments that many people think that if something is on the National Register that it means that it is of national significance, but that this is not the case. When the earthquake occurred and Katie searched for funding sources for the Daughters, we found that Hulihee Palace was only of state significance and that we would need to bump it up to make it eligible for funding.

Mr. Mills clarifies for the audience and board members the difference between the National Register and the National Historic Landmarks Program, and that the landmarks program is a much higher level of significance. He feels that it is important that we move on the register nomination, but should think about the landmark for the future.

Dr. Ikeda says that he has received some notes on this matter from State Parks, and that the board will take this up and that a discussion at the board level is needed to determine if this is basically a monarchy matter or if in addition to that is this a sort of bedrock for American expansionism

and colonialism, which is an uncomfortable statement to make. Both Hulihee and the church next door are both connected with the development of this into an American setting.

MaryAnne Maigret of state parks says that they are not going to object to the boards action should they decide to list it, but that they have concerns regarding the theme of American expansionism. She continues that State Parks would encourage that the justification be rethought and revised. She feels that the close connection to American expansionism is incorrect and that its significance is in association with the monarchy period, and that this is a more appropriate context.

Melanie Chinen comments that Katie's nomination includes American expansionism to tie it to the monarchy, which is important when working at the national level. Melanie continues that it is little bit awkward to have two divisions at odds. State Historic Preservation is responsible for doing the nominations for helping to facilitate the process of getting nominations on the register. Melanie Chinen comments to Ms. Maigret that she is disturbed that this was not given to our office until late yesterday and that this is the first that we are hearing of the comments. Chinen asked for State Parks for their concerns earlier and Mr. Young is in full support of this nomination.

Mr. Guequirre asks if the nomination as written can make the national register.

Ms. Chinen comments that that is our hope.

Mr. Guequirre asks if the additions will help it more, because he feels like we are whitewashing history.

Ms. Kastner comments that the property is already on the national register. She says that she has spoken with the National Park Service and that they want more of a history that would tie it in with the history of the United States, not just specifically talking about Hawaii.

Mr. Murison clarifies, that it is already on the register, we just want to change its significance on the register.

Ms. Kastner says that is correct, we are just trying to change the status.

Mr. Guequirre asks if we would be insulting someone by saying that the US did not have expansionist goals in the Hawaiian Islands.

Dr. Ikeda says that he can speak to this question. He says that the nomination was indirect rather than direct. If you look at the history of the development of American interests during monarchy times, you can see that the parties were in direct conflict with each other, even though they were trying to support each other. Kohala and Kona are full of missionary influence, they were trying to be supportive. This was derived in the study of Hawaiian history as part of American history. This tension needs to be clarified. The direct connection can be established to work through raising the level of significance.

Ms. Maigret comments that she would like to apologize that the testimony came in late. She continues that State Parks does not object to the significance being raised at all, they just wanted to address the justification and to see if there was a way to broaden it. Perhaps acknowledge that the monarchy was possibly as strongly influenced by European forces as by American and possibly to shift the focus to that aspect.

Mr. Hays responds that this nomination is being sent to the federal government and they will decide if it will be listed. American expansionism and colonialism is a valid argument for this nomination whether it is uncomfortable for anyone or not. They have given direction to this office to pursue that, pursuing another avenue would more than likely sabotage them. If they are pressed to get this nomination listed, then I think that we should just listen to what they are telling us, and all of those other things can be addressed in a full blown landmark nomination.

Peter Mills says that at this point we are making a recommendation whether this nomination should be reviewed by the National Park Service and are making a recommendation to the Historic Preservation Division to work with the Park Service to make that National register nomination go through. He continues that he hopes that we can make a motion to recognize that. They can then work to address concerns of State Parks and the Daughters. He continues that there are conflicts with the association of these important sites with the United States, and that this is the difference between bureaucracy and what our opinions might be. He continues that ten years after Kamehameha III was living in a grass shack in Honolulu this structure was built. This shows that shows a significant change in Hawaii. He would like for everyone to surpass these conflicts and recognize the significance of Hulihee Palace. He makes the motion that we direct the Historic Preservation Office to work with the National Park Service to update the level of significance for this property.

Dr. Ikeda asks if there is a motion to raise the level of significance for this property on the state register and to direct the division to work on the content and work with the State Parks Division.

Mr. Kodama asks if we are voting to accept the document as is.

Dr. Ikeda asks for the vote.

Board members voted unanimously to raise the level of significance for the Hulihee Palace to National Significance.

4. Tomikawa Store

Joyce Chinen moved to place the Tomikawa Store on the Hawaii Register and to recommend nomination to the National Register. James Guequirre seconded.

Tom Quinlan distributed photographs of what the property looked like before he began to work on the project.

Mr. Quinlan introduced himself to the board members. He continues by presenting photo documentation of the Tomikawa Store and describing the photos to the review board. He continues saying that they had to stabilize and jack-up the building and replaced the floor boards,

everything was done in accordance with the Secretary of the Interiors standards. He asks if there are any questions.

Ms. Kodama comments that generally when people have submitted nominations of this sort they usually document within the body of the nomination whatever changes have occurred to the exterior or interior of the building. Generally we like to know that so that we know what has been done and it is not documented in the nomination itself. She had another question about the documentation, in trying to research the property she located an article by Momi Naughton, and when she read it she realized that it was word for word the same thing that appears in the nomination papers, but there is no attribution in the nomination as to where this information came from. She found that to be irregular.

Mr. Quinlan said that that information should have been there and that Ms. Naughton helped them with the social history along with some oral history, and that should have been in there.

Mr. Guequirre comments that this is an awesome structure and that Mr. Quinlan's explanation about what has been done is explanation enough, and that he thinks everyone was filled with joy walking through the property.

Dr. Ikeda says that given the time we may need to have to defer listing.

Ms. Murison said or the board could just recommend it with conditions like they have done in the past.

Mr. Guequirre asked if they could just put Momi's name on it and vote on it. He continued that with all of the work that has gone into this that he would like to think that if the board acts on this today that they would vote to list it.

Dr. Ikeda asked if photos Mr. Quinlan presented could be part of the nomination.

Ms. Kodama also asked that the appropriate citations be included.

Mr. Quinlan said that he would most definitely include this information. He said that in the past he has been told that his nominations have been too long.

Mr. Mills comments that board has in the past accepted nominations with far less documentation, but he feels that more could be added to the oral history. More information about the work done to the original structure by Mr. Quinlan should be included as well.

Ms. Kodama moved to nominate the property to the state register and recommend it to the national register with the recommendation that all historical information is properly cited, and that any other historical information that can be gathered from oral histories be included and that the changes to the building over time be documented as much as possible so that further preservation will be ensured.

The board members vote unanimously to list the Tomikawa Store on the State Register and to recommend it to the National Register.

5. Delisting of Properties

Dr. Ikeda asked that we defer the delistings until the next meeting

V. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.