

**CULTURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION
COUNTY OF HAWAII**

**MINUTES
March 12, 2025**

MEETING LOCATION:

Hybrid in-person and interactive video conference through Zoom with live observation through YouTube. The in-person location was held at the Hilo Planning Department Conference Room, 101 Pauahi Street, Suite 3, Hilo, HI 96720.

The full YouTube video of this hearing can be found here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0jjsBtOFKz0>

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT VIA ZOOM: Desmon Haumea (Vice Chair), Roberta “Ku‘ulei” Keakealani, Kealohanuiopuna Kinney, Natalie Kurashima (arrived at 10:10 a.m.), Scott Mahoney, and Janet Six.

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Matthew Clark (Chair), Nicole Lui, and Aaron Spielman.

ALSO PRESENT: Sinclair Salas-Ferguson, Deputy Corporation Counsel; Kevin Sullivan, Planner V; Kim Tanaka, Planner IV; and Ashley DeVera, Board Secretary.

Commissioner Mahoney provided a pule to open.

Vice Chair Haumea called the Cultural Resources Commission (CRC) meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. A quorum was established with five members in attendance. It was announced that pursuant to Act 220, Session Laws of Hawaii’s 2021, which amended the Sunshine Law to allow meetings to be remotely conducted online, effective January 1, 2022, the Cultural Resources Commission meetings will be held online, with an in-person location for the public to provide testimony. The meeting can be viewed live online, and a link to YouTube can be located on the County website, as well as links to reports and surveys reviewed at this hearing. Commissioners were reminded that only one person may speak at a time and were asked to raise their hands to be recognized before speaking.

Commissioners were asked to introduce themselves and in accordance with the Sunshine Law, identify any member(s) present within the household. All members reported being alone in their location.

Staff introductions were made.

There were no addendums or supplemental agenda items.

STATEMENT(S) FROM THE PUBLIC

At 10:09 a.m., Vice Chair Haumea opened the floor to receive public testimony. Procedures for testimony were provided. There is a three-minute time limit on each agenda item; statements must relate to items on the agenda. There were two public testifiers on Zoom.

Jojo Tanimoto [*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 7:56*]

Cindy Freitas [*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 1:02:05*]

Public testimony closed at 11:08 a.m.

BUSINESS OF THE COMMISSION

1. Hawai'i Department of Transportation (HDOT) Historic Bridge Program, 2024 Inventory Update

Presentation and Q&A with HDOT regarding updates to the Hawai'i Island Historic Bridge Inventory.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 6:51*] This agenda item was called to order at 10:10 a.m. There were three team members from HDOT in attendance. There were two members of the public present on Zoom and public testimony was provided.

Commissioner Kurashima joined the meeting. Quorum was confirmed with six commissioners.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 13:45*] Commissioner Mahoney noticed the list was missing numerous historic bridges and inquired why it is not a complete list. Ms. Pua Aiu responded, it's a limited update and Mr. Guy Blanchard provided an explanation of why the bridges Ms. Tanimoto inquired about are not on the list.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 24:55*] Ms. Aiu provided a brief introduction. A presentation was given by Mr. Blanchard regarding the 2024 State Historic Bridge Inventory and Evaluation (SHBIE) update. HDOT seeks the Commission's comments on the report.

The report is an update to the 2013 SHBIE report, and HDOT evaluated over seven hundred bridges in all counties throughout the state that was constructed before 1967. The report includes a standardized inventory form, a bridge matrix for each county, a historic context through 1974, information about bridge types, and outlines relevant state and federal laws.

The 2024 SHBIE update focuses on HDOT's one hundred (100) priority bridges, which were identified by utility rating, bridges altered since the 2013 SHBIE report, and bridges that were constructed between 1968 and 1977. The 2024 SHBIE follows the methodology and approach from the 2013 SHBIE. The items that were pulled from the 2013 SHBIE includes Chapter Two: bridge type summary; Chapter Three: historic context; survey forms; Appendix E (including supplemental information such as a glossary of terms, bridge rehabilitation guidelines, and preservation plans); and Appendix F (including National Register registration forms for bridges

throughout the state).

New additions provided in the 2024 SHBIE includes the historic context, expanded to extend through the 1980s, new forms for the re-evaluated bridges or bridges that had been altered, and the incorporation of the historic bridge programmatic agreement. Ten (10) new forms for Hawai'i County were completed, which included robust descriptions of the bridges, statements of significance, integrity assessments, new maps, and multiple photographs. Bridges that fell under the program comment exemption for common post-1945 bridges did not receive forms but were included in the matrix and listed in the inventory. Bridges that had been demolished and replaced with new bridges had their forms removed, as those bridges no longer existed and did not meet the fifty (50) year threshold.

In summary, fifty-five (55) bridges in total were reviewed, including the ten (10) HDOT priority bridges. Thirteen (13) bridges were flagged as potentially altered since 2013, thirty (30) bridges were built between 1968 and 1977, and two (2) bridges were demolished and replaced. During the re-evaluation, three (3) bridges were recommended as not eligible. The thirteen (13) potentially altered bridges were likely involved in activities such as roadway repairs, repaving, or small repairs to the bridge itself, which are not discernable. The thirty (30) bridges that were constructed between 1968 to 1977, were common, standardized bridge types that were not distinct under Section 106 and thus fell under the program comment exemption for common post-1945 bridges.

This concluded the presentation. Mr. Blanchard then opened the floor for any questions.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 33:41*] Mr. Sullivan questioned the list of potentially altered and replaced bridges and asked why “n/a” was listed. Mr. Blanchard responded that those bridges had been demolished and were removed from the list.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 35:30*] Commissioner Six questioned whether those bridges were exempt from 6E. Mr. Blanchard responded that they were not exempt from 6E, and it had been previously commented that HDOT should indicate on the survey form whether the bridge was a significant historic property under 6E, as well as a historic property under Section 106. HDOT proposed bridges that did not receive forms should be sent to State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) for an evaluation to determine if these bridges were not significant.

Commissioner Six commented to be mindful that the bridge itself might not have significance today, given that it is a standard bridge, but in the future it might. Also to consider what the bridges are adjacent to, such as archaeological and culturally significant sites.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 37:22*] Vice Chair Haumea commented on the cultural significance that could be attached to the bridges and the sites that may have eroded over time.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 37:46*] Commissioner Kinney questioned whether there would be a geographic information system story map with the location of the historic bridges, and a place to celebrate and honor the cultural heritage beyond the period when the bridge was built. The bridges educates about the ahupua'a system, features on the landscape, and often crossed

watershed features that marked the delineation points for different ahupua‘a. Commissioner Kinney emphasized the importance of honoring the sense of place, providing educational value, and cultivating greater cohesion around the history of these spaces.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 40:32*] Vice Chair Haumea recommended including the historical significance and engagement with communities.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 44:06*] Commissioner Keakealani commented that all bridges have historical significance, and that significance is not just about the construction or the type of bridge. Bridges also cross over trails or gullies, and she questioned why there were “unnamed gully” entries on the list. Commissioner Keakealani encouraged looking at what would deem a bridge significant beyond its type, materials, and how it was built.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 48:27*] Commissioner Kurashima recommended creating a flow chart to show how these bridges had been selected, to clarify why those bridges were on the inventory list, and to provide recognition for the significance of the bridges that exist in cultural landscapes. Ms. Aiu clarified that the bridge inventory was specific to the bridges and not the landscape. There was a specific set of criteria and a limited scope of work for just the bridges. The National Register eligibility criteria were based on National Historic Preservation Law.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 57:32*] Mr. Blanchard clarified regarding the bridges listed in Ms. Jojo Tanimoto’s testimony. The first bridge had been replaced and constructed after 1977, and once the bridge reached the appropriate age, it would be included in the next inventory update. The second bridge was in the inventory but had been determined to be not eligible. The third, fourth, and sixth bridges had previously been determined to be program comment exempt, meaning they were in the inventory but did not have a form. The fifth bridge, for which HDOT could not find the name, may have a different designation by HDOT and may require further research.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 1:04:27*] Commissioner Six recommend that the older bridges and the role the bridges played should be researched, cultural practitioners should be consulted, and consideration should be given to archaeological sites that might be adjacent to the bridges.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 1:07:55*] Commissioner Kinney understood the constraints of the HDOT identification process and advice on ways to incorporate the cultural significance of these places. Commissioner Mahoney recommended that the CRC create a template of the information they wanted for the bridges.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 1:16:34*] All Commissioners agreed to continue this matter to the next meeting.

This matter concluded at 11:20 a.m.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Approval of minutes of the meeting held on February 12, 2025.

[*SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP – 1:17:13*] Commissioner Six motioned to approve the minutes as circulated; seconded by Commissioner Kinney. No discussion occurred. The minutes were approved without opposition with a unanimous aye voice vote.

2. Next meeting tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, May 14, 2025.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:22 a.m. with a unanimous aye vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ashley DeVera, Board Secretary

A T T E S T :

Desmon Haumea, Vice Chairman
Cultural Resources Commission