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INTRODUCTION

Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. (SCS) has been contracted by Group 70 International Inc., to conduct a Cultural Impact Assessment of 77-acres for the proposed construction of K. Hei High School in K. Hei Ka‘ono‘ulu, K. Hei 1 & 2 and Waiohuli Ahu‘pu‘a, Makawao District, Island of Maui, Hawai‘i (TMK: 2-2-002:035 por. and 054 por.) (Figures 1 and 2). The development of a new high school is proposed and would include a library, auditorium, cafeteria, administration building, industrial arts building, ROTC facility, physical education and athletic buildings, gymnasium, and bleachers.

The Constitution of the State of Hawai‘i clearly states the duty of the State and its agencies is to preserve, protect, and prevent interference with the traditional and customary rights of native Hawaiians. Article XII, Section 7 requires the State to “protect all rights, customarily and traditionally exercised for subsistence, cultural and religious purposes and possessed by ahupua‘a tenants who are descendants of native Hawaiians who inhabited the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778” (2000). In spite of the establishment of the foreign concept of private ownership and western-style government, Kamehameha III (Ka‘u‘au‘ula) preserved the people’s traditional right to subsistence. As a result in 1850, the Hawaiian Government confirmed the traditional access rights to native Hawaiian ahupua‘a tenants to gather specific natural resources for customary uses from undeveloped private property and waterways under the Hawaiian Revised Statutes (HRS) 7-1. In 1992, the State of Hawai‘i Supreme Court reaffirmed HRS 7-1 and expanded it to include, “native Hawaiian rights...may extend beyond the ahupua‘a in which a native Hawaiian resides where such rights have been customarily and traditionally exercised in this manner” (Pele Defense Fund v. Paty, 73 Haw.578, 1992).

In Section 1 of Act 50, enacted by the Legislature of the State of Hawai‘i (2000) with House Bill 2895, it is stated that:

...there is a need to clarify that the preparation of environmental assessments or environmental impact statements should identify and address effects on Hawaii’s culture, and traditional and customary rights...[H.B. NO. 2895].

Articles IX and XII of the state constitution, other state laws, and the courts of the State impose on government agencies a duty to promote and protect cultural beliefs and practices, and resources of native Hawaiians as well as other ethnic groups. Act 50 also requires state agencies and other developers to assess the effects of proposed land use or shore line developments on the “cultural practices of the community and State” as part of the HRS Chapter 343 environmental review process (2001).

Figure 1: USGS Quadrangle Map Showing Project Area.
It also re-defined the definition of “significant effect” to include “the sum of effects on the quality of the environment including actions impact a natural resource; limit the range of beneficial uses of the environment, that are contrary to the State’s environmental policies... or adversely affect the economic welfare, social welfare, or cultural practices of the community and State” (H.B. 2885, Act 50, 2000). Cultural resources can include a broad range of often overlapping categories, including places, behaviors, values, beliefs, objects, records, stories, etc. (H.B. 2895, Act 40, 2000).

Thus, Act 50 requires that an assessment of cultural practices and the possible impacts of a proposed action be included in Environmental Assessments and Environmental Impact Statements, and to be taken into consideration during the planning process. The concept of geographical expansion is recognized by using, as an example, “the broad geographical area, e.g. district or ahupua’a” (OEQC 1997). It was decided that the process should identify “anthropological” cultural practices, rather than “social” cultural practices. For example, ‘limu’ (edible seaweed) gathering would be considered an anthropological cultural practice, while a modern-day marathon would be considered a social cultural practice.

Therefore, the purpose of a Cultural Impact Assessment is to identify the possibility of cultural activities and resources within a project area, or its vicinity, and then assessing the potential for impacts on these cultural resources. The CIA is not intended to be a document of in-depth archival-historical land research, or a record of oral family histories, unless these records contain information about specific cultural resources that might be impacted by a proposed project.

According to the Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts established by the Hawaii State Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC 1997):

The types of cultural practices and beliefs subject to assessment may include subsistence, commercial, residential, agricultural, access-related, recreational, and religious and spiritual customs. The types of cultural resources subject to assessment may include traditional cultural properties or other types of historic sites, both manmade and natural, which support such cultural beliefs.
The meaning of “traditional” was explained in National Register Bulletin:

Traditional” in this context refers to those beliefs, customs, and practices of a living community of people that have been passed down through the generations, usually orally or through practice. The traditional cultural significance of a historic property, then, is significance derived from the role the property plays in a community’s historically rooted beliefs, customs, and practices. . . . [Parker and King 1990:1]

**METHODOLOGY**

This Cultural Impact Assessment was prepared in accordance with the suggested methodology and content protocol in the Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts (OEQC 1997). In outlining the “Cultural Impact Assessment Methodology”, the OEQC states that:

“...information may be obtained through scoping, community meetings, ethnographic interviews and oral histories…” (1997).

This report contains archival and documentary research, as well as communication with organizations having knowledge of the project area, its cultural resources, and its practices and beliefs. This Cultural Impact Assessment was prepared in accordance with the suggested methodology and content protocol provided in the Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts (OEQC 1997), when possible. The assessment concerning cultural impacts may address, but not be limited to, the following matters:

(1) a discussion of the methods applied and results of consultation with individuals and organizations identified by the preparer as being familiar with cultural practices and features associated with the project area, including any constraints or limitations which might have affected the quality of the information obtained;

(2) a description of methods adopted by the preparer to identify, locate, and select the persons interviewed, including a discussion of the level of effort undertaken;

(3) ethnographic and oral history interview procedures, including the circumstances under which the interviews were conducted, and any constraints or limitations which might have affected the quality of the information obtained;

(4) biographical information concerning the individuals and organizations consulted, their particular expertise, and their historical and genealogical relationship to the project area, as well as information concerning the persons submitting information or being interviewed, their particular knowledge and cultural expertise, if any, and their historical and genealogical relationship to the project area;

(5) a discussion concerning historical and cultural source materials consulted, the institutions and repositories searched, and the level of effort undertaken, as well as the particular perspective of the authors, if appropriate, any opposing views, and any other relevant constraints, limitations or biases;

(6) a discussion concerning the cultural resources, practices and beliefs identified, and for the resources and practices, their location within the broad geographical area in which the proposed action is located, as well as their direct or indirect significance or connection to the project site;

(7) a discussion concerning the nature of the cultural practices and beliefs, and the significance of the cultural resources within the project area, affected directly or indirectly by the proposed project;

(8) an explanation of confidential information that has been withheld from public disclosure in the assessment;

(9) a discussion concerning any conflicting information in regard to identified cultural resources, practices and beliefs;

(10) an analysis of the potential effect of any proposed physical alteration on cultural resources, practices, or beliefs; the potential of the proposed action to isolate cultural resources, practices, or beliefs from their setting and the potential of the proposed action to introduce elements which may alter the setting in which cultural practices take place, and;

(11) the inclusion of bibliography of references, and attached records of interviews which were allowed to be disclosed.

Based on the inclusion of the above information, assessments of the potential effects on cultural resources in the project area and recommendations for mitigation of these effects can be proposed.

**ARCHIVAL RESEARCH**

Archival research focused on a historical documentary study involving both published and unpublished sources. These included legendary accounts of native and early foreign writers; early historical journals and narratives; historic maps and land records such as Land Commission Awards, Royal Patent Grants, and Boundary Commission records; historic accounts; and previous archaeological project reports.
INTERVIEW METHODOLOGY

Interviews are conducted in accordance with Federal and State laws, and guidelines, when knowledgeable individuals are able to identify cultural practices in, or in close proximity to the project area. If they have knowledge of traditional stories, practices and beliefs associated with a project area or if they know of historical properties within the project area, they are sought out for additional consultation and interviews. Individuals who have particular knowledge of traditions passed down from preceding generations and a personal familiarity with the project area are invited to share their relevant information concerning particular cultural resources. Often people are recommended for their expertise, and indeed, organizations, such as Hawaiian Civic Clubs, the Island Branch of Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), historical societies, Island Trail clubs, and Planning Commissions are depend upon for their recommendations of suitable informants. These groups are invited to contribute their input, and suggest further avenues of inquiry, as well as specific individuals to interview. It should be stressed that this process does not include formal ethnographic interviews or oral histories as described in the OEQC’s Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts (1997). The assessments are intended to identify potential impacts to ongoing cultural practices or resources within a project area or its close vicinity.

If knowledgeable individuals are identified, personal interviews are sometimes taped and then transcribed. These draft transcripts are returned to each of the participants for their review and comments. After corrections are made, each individual signs a release form, making the information available for this study. When telephone interviews occur, a summary of the information is usually sent for correction and approval, or dictated by the informant and then incorporated into the document. If no cultural resource information is forthcoming and no knowledgeable informants are suggested for further inquiry, interviews are not conducted.

Letters were sent to organizations whose jurisdiction included knowledge of the area. Consultation was sought from Phyllis (Coochie) Cayan, History and Culture Branch Chief with SHPD; Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Oahu Branch; Hulaiwa Shimokoa, OHA Maui Branch; Charles Maxwell, Maui Island Burial Council; Kimo Kapaulehua, Dept. of Planning, Cultural Resources Commission; Hinano Rodrigues, DLNR; Ke`ai Community Association; and Central Maui Hawaiian Civic Club (Appendix A).

In addition, a Cultural Impact Assessment Notice was published on March 28, 30, and 31, 2010 in The Honolulu Advertiser and The Maui New, and in the April issue of the OHA newspaper, Na Wai Ola (Appendix B). These notices requested information of cultural resources or activities in the area of the proposed project, gave the TMK number and where to respond with information. Based on the responses, an assessment of the potential effects on cultural resources in the project area and recommendations for mitigation of these effects can be proposed.

PROJECT AREA AND VICINITY

The project area is roughly rectangular in shape and consists of a 77-acre lot that is bounded by Kulanihakoi Gulch to the north, Waipuilani Gulch to the south, undeveloped ranch land to the east and Pi`ilani Highway to the west. The parcel is located one kilometer inland from Kalepolepolo Park at elevations ranging from 30 feet to 100 feet above mean sea level and is currently undeveloped.

CULTURAL HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The island of Maui ranks second in size of the eight main islands in the Hawaiian Archipelago. The Island was formed by two volcanoes, Mount Kukui in the west and Haleakal`a in the east. The younger of the two volcanoes, Haleakal`a, is 2,727 m (9,023 feet) above sea level and embodies the largest section of the island. Unlike the amphitheater valleys of West Maui, the flanks of Haleakal`a are distinguished by gentle slopes. Although it receives more rain than its counterpart in the west, the permeable lavas of the Honomanu and Kula Volcanic Series prevent the formation of rain-fed perennial streams. The few perennial streams found on the windward side of Haleakal`a originate from springs located at low elevations. Valleys and gulches were formed by intermittent water run-off. The environment factors and resource availability heavily influenced pre-contact settlement patterns. Although an extensive population was found occupying the uplands above the 30-inch rainfall line where crops could easily be grown, coastal settlement was also common (Kolb et al. 1997). The existence of three fishponds at Kalepolepo, north of the project area, and at least two heiau have been identified near the shore.

The literature confirms the presence of a stable population relying mainly on coastal and marine resources. Agriculture may have been practiced behind the dune berms in low-lying marshland or in the vicinity of Kealia Pond. It is suggested that permanent habitation and their associated activities occurred from A.D. 1200 through the present in both the uplands and coastal region (Ibid.).
PAST POLITICAL BOUNDARIES

Traditionally, the division of Maui’s lands into districts (moku) and sub-districts was performed by a kahuna (priest, expert) named Kalaiha’ /ga/ during the time of the ali`i Kaka`alaneo (Beckwith 1940:369; Fornander places Kaka`alaneo at the end of the 15th century or the beginning of the 16th century [Fornander 1919-20, Vol. 6:248]). Land was considered the property of the king or ali`i `ai moku (the ali`i who eats the island/district), which he held in trust for the gods. The title of ali`i `ai moku ensured rights and responsibilities to the land, but did not confer absolute ownership. The king kept the parcels he wanted, his higher chiefs received large parcels from him and, in turn, distributed smaller parcels to lesser chiefs. The maka`/ga/nana (commoners) worked the individual plots of land.

In general, several terms, such as moku, ahupua`a, `ili or `ili`/ga/nana were used to delineate various land sections. A district (moku) contained smaller land divisions (ahupua`a), which customarily continued inland from the ocean and upland into the mountains. Extended household groups living within an ahupua`a were therefore, able to harvest from both the land and the sea. Ideally, this situation allowed each ahupua`a to be self-sufficient by supplying needed resources from different environmental zones (Lyons 1875:111). The `ili`/ga/nana or `ili were smaller land divisions next to importance to the ahupua`a and were administered by the chief who controlled the ahupua`a in which it was located (ibid:33; Lucas 1995:40). The mo`o`/ga/nana were narrow strips of land within an `ili. The land holding of a tenant or hoa `/ga/nana residing in an ahupua`a was called a kuleana (Lucas 1995:61).

TRADITIONAL SETTLEMENT PATTERNS

The Hawaiian economy was based on agricultural production and marine exploitation, as well as raising livestock and collecting wild plants and birds. Extended household groups settled in various ahupua`a. Within the ahupua`a, residents were able to harvest from both the land and the sea. Ideally, this situation allowed each ahupua`a to be self-sufficient by supplying needed resources from different environmental zones (Lyons 1875:111).

During pre-Contact times, there were primarily two types of agriculture, wetland and dry land, both of which were dependent upon geography and physiography. River valleys provided ideal conditions for wetland kalo (Colocasia esculenta) agriculture that incorporated pond fields and irrigation canals. Other cultigens, such as k/u (sugar cane, Saccharum officinarum) and mai`a (banana, Musa sp.), were also grown and, where appropriate, such crops as `uala (sweet potato, Ipomoea batatas) were produced. This was the typical agricultural pattern seen during traditional times on all the Hawaiian Islands (Kirch and Sahlins 1992, Vol. 1:5, 119; Kirch 1985). Agricultural development on the leeward side of Maui was likely to have begun early in what is known as the Expansion Period (AD 1200-1400, Kirch 1985). According to Handy, there was continuous cultivation on the coastal region along the northwest coast of Maui.

On the south side of western Maui the flat coastal plain all the way from K`ehi and M`a`alae to Honokohau, in old Hawaiian times, must have supported many fishing settlements and isolated fishermen’s houses, where sweet potatoes were grown in the sandy soil or red lepo [soil] near the shore. For fishing, this coast is the most favorable on Maui, and, although a considerable amount of taro was grown, I think it is reasonable to suppose that the large fishing population which presumably inhabited this leeward coast, ate more sweet potatoes than taro with their fish...[1940:159].

There is little specific information pertaining directly to K`ehi, which was originally a small area adjacent to a landing built in the 1890s (Clark 1980). Presently, K`ehi refers to a six-mile section along the coast from the town of K`ehi to Keawakapu. The present project area is located in what has been referred to as the “barren zone” (Candy 1997). This zone was an intermediate region between verdant upland regions and the coastline. In the transitional/barren zone, agriculture endeavors were practically non-existent and tool procurement materials, such as basalt rock and wood, were selected from other locales. Sediment regimes in the area are shallow, most often overlaying bedrock, and perennial water sources are virtually non-existent. In addition, the immediate slope in back of the coast receives less than 30 inches of rainfall annually, which is needed for productive cultivation (ibid.).

The barren zone is perceived as dry and antagonistic to permanent habitation, as well. Use of the area would have primarily been intermittent, or transitory, but would have supported trails extending between the two more profitable eco-zones of the coast and the higher slopes of Haleakal`

Confirming this, Handy continued...

Between K`ehi and M`a`alae there was probably very little settlement in former times. Today along this dry coast there are a few settlements and houses and a few gardens with sweet potatoes (ibid.)
Scattered amongst the few habitation sites along the coast were places of cultural significance to the kama`ina of the district including at least two heiau. In ancient times, there was a small village at Kalepolepo, supported primarily by marine resources. It was recorded that occasionally the blustery Kaumuku Winds would arrive with amazing intensity along the coast (Wilcox 1922).

There were several fishponds in the vicinity of K`ei, Waiohuli, Kea-kai, and Kalepolepo Pond (also known by the ancient name of K`iel`e`e Pond; Kolb et al. 1997). Constructed on the boundary between Ka`orea and Waiohui Ahupua`a, these three ponds were some of the most important royal fishponds on Maui. The builder of Kalepolepo and two other ponds (Waiohuli and Kea-kai) has been lost in antiquity, but they were reportedly rebuilt at least three times through history, beginning during the reign of Pi`ilani (1500s; ibid; Cordy 2000).

Oral tradition recounted the repairing of the fishponds during the reign of Kiha-Pi`ilani, the son of the great chief Pi`ilani, who had bequeathed the ponds to Umi, ruler of Hawai`i Island. Umi`s konohiki (land manager) ordered all the people from Maui to help repair the walls of Kalepolepo`s fishponds. A man named Kikau protested that the repairs couldn`t be done without the assistance of the menehune who were master builders (Wilcox 1921:66-67). The konohiki was furious and Kikau was told he would die once the repairs had been made. Kea-kai was the first to be repaired. When the capstone was carried on a litter to the site, the konohiki rode proudly on top of the rock as it was being placed in the northeast corner of the pond. When it was time for repairs on Waiohuli-kai, the konohiki did the same. As the last pond, then known as Ka`ono`ulu-kai, was completed, the konohiki once again rode the capstone to its resting place. Before it could be put into position, the capstone broke throwing both the rock and konohiki onto the dirt. The workers reportedly said "Ua konohiki Kalepolepo, ua eku i ka lepo" or, "the manager of Kalepolepo, one who roots in the dirt" (Ibid:66). That night a tremendous storm threw down the walls of the fishponds. The konohiki implored Kikau to help him repair the damage. Kikau called the menehune who rebuilt the walls in one night. Umi sent for Kikau who lived in the court of Waipi`o valley from then on. The region of Kea-kai and Ka`orea was known as Kalepolepo fishpond (ibid).

The Kalepolepo fishponds were rebuilt by Kekaulike, chief of Maui in the 1700s, at which time it supplied `ama`ama (mullet) to Kahekili II. Again, it was restored by Kamehameha I when he ruled as governing chief over Maui and for the last time in the 1840s when prisoners from Kaho`olawe penal colony were sent to do repairs (Kamakau 1963; Wilcox 1923). At this time, stones were taken from Waiohuli-kai pond for the reconstruction of Kalepolepo. It was here at Kalepolepo that Kamehameha I reportedly beached his victorious canoes after subduing the Maui chiefs. The stream draining into Kealia pond (north of the project area) became sacred to royalty and kupa`a to commoners (Stoddard 1894).

 Trails extended from the coast to the mountains, linking the two for both economic and social reasons. A trail known as the `anaha or "King`s trail" built by K`iha`i ali`i, extended along the coast passing through all the major communities between L`oihi and M`ekena, including K`ei. Kolb noted that two traditional trails extended through K`eakai. One trail, named "Kekuawaha`ula`ula" or the "red-mouthed god", went from K`ei inland to K`keakai. Another, the Kalepolepo trail, began at the Kalepolepo fishpond and continued up and Waiohuli. These trails were not only used in the pre-Contact era, but were expanded to accommodate wagons bringing produce to the coast in the 1850s (Kolb et al. 1997).
The appearance of this side of Mowee was scarcely less forbidding than that of its southern parts, which we had passed the preceding day. The shores, however, were not so steep and rocky, and were mostly composed of a sandy beach; the land did not rise so very abruptly from the sea towards the mountains, nor was its surface so much broken with hills and deep chasms; yet the soil had little appearance of fertility, and no cultivation was to be seen. A few habitations were promiscuously scattered near the waterside, and the inhabitants who came off to us, like those seen the day before, had little to dispose of [Vancouver 1984:852].

Archibald Menzies, a naturalist accompanying Vancouver stated, “…we had some canoes off from the latter island [Maui], but they brought no refreshments. Indeed, this part of the island appeared to be very barren and thinly inhabited” (Menzies 1920:102). According to Kahikilili, then chief of Maui, the extreme poverty in the area was the result of the continuous wars between Maui and Hawai‘i Island causing the land to be neglected and human resources wasted (Vancouver 1984:856).

THE GREAT MĀHELE

In the 1840s, traditional land tenure shifted drastically with the introduction of private land ownership based on western law. While it is a complex issue, many scholars believe that in order to protect Hawaiian sovereignty from foreign powers, Kauikeaouli (Kamehameha III) was forced to establish laws changing the traditional Hawaiian economy to that of a market economy (Kame‘eleihiwa 1992:169-70, 176; Kelly 1983:45, 1998:4; Daws 1962:111; Kuykendall 1938 Vol. I:145). The Great Māhele of 1848 divided Hawaiian lands between the king, the chiefs, the government, and began the process of private ownership of lands. The subsequently awarded parcels were called Land Commission Awards (LCAs). Once lands were thus made available and private ownership was instituted, the maka‘ana (commoners), if they had been made aware of the procedures, were able to claim the plots on which they had been cultivating and living. These claims did not include any previously cultivated but presently fallow land, ʻokipu ʻo ʻahu, stream fisheries, or many other resources necessary for traditional survival (Kelly 1983; Kame‘eleihiwa 1992:295; Kirch and SHahin 1992). If occupation could be established through the testimony of two witnesses, the petitioners were awarded the claimed LCA and issued a Royal Patent after which they could take possession of the property (Chinen 1961:169, Hewahewa, Kamehameha’s Kahunna Nui, was awarded Kā‘ono‘u‘u (LCA 3237).

As western influence grew, Kalepolepo in Kūhei became the important provisioning area. Europeans were now living on or frequently visiting the coast, and several churches and missionary stations were established. A Mr. Halstead left medical school on the East coast of the continent to become a whaler and after marrying the granddaughter of Issac Davis, settled in Kalepolepo on land given him by Kamehameha III (Kolb et al. 1997). His residence and store situated at Kalepolepo landing was known as the Koa House having been constructed of koa logs brought from the uplands of Kula. The store flourished due to the whaling and successful upland potato industry, and provided an accessible port for exported produce. A landing was built at Kūhei around 1890. Several of Hawai‘i’s ruling monarchs stayed at the Koa House, including Kaukeaouli (Kamehameha III), Kamehameha the IV, Lot Kamehameha (V), and Lunalilo.

Willox, giving a glimpse of the surroundings before abandonment stated, “…Kalepolepo was not so barren looking a place. Coconut trees grew beside pools of clear warm water along the banks of which grew laro and apes…” (1921:67). However, by 1887 this had changed. Wilcox continues:

…the Kula mountains had become denuded of their forests, torrential winter rains were washing down earth from the uplands, filling with silt the ponds at Kalepolepo… ruins of grass huts [were] partly covered by drifting sand, and a few weather-beaten houses perched on the broad top of the old fish pond wall at the edge of the sea, with the Halstead house looming over them dim and shadowy in the daily swirl of dust and flying sand…” (1921:67)

Ranching was present prior to the 1840s and large sections of Crown Lands were leased for grazing cattle. By the 1880s, the lower kula lands, including the project area, consisted primarily of pasture land for ranching. Large portions of Kā‘ono‘u‘u Ahupua‘a were used for cattle by the Ka‘ono‘u Ranch Co. Ltd and Ulupalakua Ranch, Inc.

INTERVIEW

An interview was conducted in 2000 with Mr. Henry Rice, owner of Kā‘ono‘u Ranch (containing the present project area) by SCS pertaining to another cultural impact assessment (McGerty and Spear 2000). Mr. Rice is descended from the Kamehameha family and, at that time, the ranch consisted of approximately 9,000 acres of land that had been held by the Rice family since 1916. Mr. Rice stated that land was used for pastureage both up slope and near the coast where the project is located. The cattle were rotated according to vegetation growth, up and down the slope. In the 1950s, most of the breeding herds were kept on the Kamehameha lands. At the
time of the interview, breeding herds were being kept both mauka of Kula highway and makai. Calves from the makai breeding herd were born in October and November when the winter rains brought grasses that provided healthy milk for the newborn. Mr. Rice did not know of any old trails, traditional properties, or cultural activities occurring on his Ka`ono`ulu Ranch lands. He did mention that in the late 1800s people living in the kula region were still obtaining fish from the Ka`ono`ulu fishpond in K. hel.

With the introdution of a dependable water supply in 1952 to the dry K. hel region, came overseas investment and development for the tourist industry, which has continued up to, and including, this time.

SUMMARY

The "level of effort undertaken" to identify potential effect by a project to cultural resources, places or beliefs (OEQC 1997) has not been officially defined and is left up to the investigator. A good faith effort can mean contacting agencies by letter, interviewing people who know of cultural resources and activities that may be affected by the project or who know its history, conducting research identifying sensitive areas and previous land use, holding meetings in which the public is invited to testify, notifying the community through the media, and other appropriate strategies based on the type of project being proposed and its impact potential. Sending inquiring letters to organizations concerning development of a piece of property that has already been totally impacted by previous activity and is located in an already developed industrial area may be a "good faith effort". However, when many factors need to be considered, such as in coastal or mountain development, a good faith effort might mean an entirely different level of research activity.

In the case of the present parcel, letters were sent to organizations whose jurisdiction included knowledge of the area. Consultation was sought from Philiss (Coochie) Cayan, History and Culture Branch Chief with SHPD; Office of Hawaiian Affairs, O`ahu Branch; Theadora Shimaoka, OHA Maui Branch; Charles Maxwell, Maui Island Burial Council; Kimiko Kapululehua, Dept. of Planning, Cultural Resources Commission; Hinano Rodrigues, DLNR; K. hel Community Association; and Central Maui Hawaiian Civic Club.

In addition, a Cultural Impact Assessment Notice was published on March 28, 30, and 31, 2010 in The Honolulu Advertiser and The Maui New, and in the April issue if the OHA newspaper, Na Wai Ola. These notices requested information of cultural resources or activities in the area of the proposed project, gave the TMK number and where to respond with information.

Historical and cultural source materials were extensively used and can be found listed in the References Cited portion of the report. Such scholars as i`i, Kamakau, Malo, Beckwith, Chinen, Kamakau, Hiona, Fox, Forandier, Kaykendall, Kelly, Handy, Handy, Puku`i and Elbert, Thrall, Sterling, and Cordy have contributed, and continue to contribute to our knowledge and understanding of Hawai`i, past and present. The works of these and other authors were consulted and incorporated in the report where appropriate. Land use document research was supplied by the Waihona Aina 2009 Data bank.

In addition, an archaeological report specific to the project vicinity was reviewed. Early archaeological investigations and historic documentation in the vicinity of the project area suggested that the area was marginally utilized in pre-Contact times and had been used in the historic era primarily for ranching activities and WWII military training exercises. An Archaeological Inventory Survey of the 77-acres was conducted in 2010 (Perzinski and Dega 2010). The study included a 100% pedestrian survey and limited subsurface testing and there-documentation of one site, SHP No.:0-50-10-6393, consisting of eight features (seven mounds, one alignment). Three test units were excavated at this site to aid in the understanding of the functional interpretation of the features. After analysis, it was decided the features were historic and associated with ranching activities. No new sites were identified during the Inventory Survey.

Archaeology deals with material remains, and although cultural beliefs are often reflected through some sort of architecture, like heiau, or ko`a, there are many examples of cultural associations still important to the community with no physical structures to mark their significance. One such place, `Ualahui O Lani kita, located on M doka`i, is considered an extremely sacred spot. Another might be K. lana or Halema`uma`u, home of Pele. These places have become important sites supporting a traditional belief system still held by the many peoples of Hawai`i. They contain no identified archaeological features, however they are highly meaningful "... because of [their] association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community..." (King 2003:3).
CIA INQUIRY RESPONSE

Two responses were received from the above listed organizations or news periodical announcements (Appendix C). Neither contained additional information concerning on-going cultural activities, or resources in the project area. This would be expected from an area known for its general lack of pre-Contact usage. The letter that was emailed to the Kʻe Community Association was returned due to “no Answer”.

One letter was from the Oʻahu Branch of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs acknowledging receipt of the letter if inquiry. The other letter was from Philip (Coochie) Cayon, History and Culture Branch Chief with SHPD, also acknowledging receipt of the letter of inquiry and suggesting several contacts, many of whom had already been contacted with no results. This letter was received after the waiting period of one month had expired.

Analysis of the potential effect of the project on cultural resources, practices or beliefs, its potential to isolate cultural resources, practices or beliefs from their setting, and the potential of the project to introduce elements which may alter the setting in which cultural practices take place is a requirement of the OEQC (No. 10, 1997). To our knowledge, the project area has not been used for traditional cultural purposes within recent times.

CULTURAL ASSESSMENT

Based on no additional suggestions or information from the contacted organizations, newspapers, and negative results of the archival research, it is reasonable to conclude that, pursuant to Act 50, the exercise of native Hawaiian rights, or any ethnic group, related to gathering, access or other customary activities will not be affected by development activities. Because there were no cultural activities identified within the project area, there are no adverse effects.
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APPENDIX A: INQUIRY LETTERS

Central Maui
Hawaiian Civic Club
319 Kalioukou Ave.
Kahului, Maui 96732

March 18, 2016

Dear Members,

Scientific Consultants Services, Inc. (SCS) has been commissioned by Group 70 International to conduct a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) of land parcel consisting of 77 acres in Kīhei, Kāne‘ohe, Kōloa, ‘ōia‘i‘i, and Waiholi in O‘ahu, Makawao District, Maui Island (TMR 2-2.002.015 (poc.) and 854 (poc.)). According to documents supplied by Group 70 International, the project area is planned for the development of a new high school and will include a library, auditorium, cafeteria, administration building, memorial area building, ROTC facility, physical education and athletic buildings, gymnasium, and bleachers.

According to the Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts (Office of Environmental Quality Control), Nov. 1997:

The types of cultural practices and beliefs subject to assessment may include subsistence, commercial, residential, agricultural, economic-related, recreational, and religious and spiritual customs. The types of cultural resources subject to assessment may include traditional cultural properties or other types of historic sites, both man-made and natural which support such cultural beliefs.

We are asking you for any information that might assist us in gathering knowledge of traditional activities, or traditional rights that might be impacted by development of the property. The results of our assessments rely greatly on the assistance and support of individuals and organizations such as yours. Enclosed are maps showing the proposed project areas. Please contact me at our SCS Honolulu office at (808) 997-1102; or cell phone, 225-2505; or home, (808) 637-9539, with any information or recommendations concerning this Cultural Impact Assessment.

Sincerely yours,

Lorraine Mclerry, Senior Archaeologist
Enquiries (2)
Dear Mr. Nishimura:

Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. (SCS) has been contracted by Group 70 International to conduct a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) of land parcels consisting of 72 acres in Ko'olau, Kula, and Waihainu, Maui County. According to documents supplied by Group 70 International, the project area is planned for the development of a new high school and will include a library, auditorium, cafeteria, administration building, industrial arts building, ROTC facility, physical education and athletic buildings, gymnasium, and bleachers. In 2010, an Archaeological Inventory Survey Report by Furlanetti and O'Shaughnessy was submitted to the DOE and contains a summary of previous archeological work in the area.

Other contacts include Phyllis Opyan, UH-Hilo, Charles Lex, Kahului, Kapalamaheo, Maui County, Planning and Cultural Resources, Hilo, and Niihau Niihau, Kahanu, and Central Maui Hawaiian Civic Club.

According to the Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts (Office of Environmental Quality Control, Nov. 1997):

The types of cultural properties subject to assessment may include residential, commercial, agricultural, ocean-related, recreational, and religious and spiritual entities. The types of cultural resources subject to assessment may include traditional cultural properties or other types of historic sites that have been used or modified for cultural purposes.

We are asking you for any information that might assist us in gathering knowledge of traditional activities, or cultural entities that might be impacted by development of the property. The results of our assessment rely greatly on the assistance and response of individuals and organizations such as yours. Enclosed are maps showing the proposed project area. Please contact us at SCS Honolulu office at (808) 397-1182; my cell phone, 225-2353; or home, (808) 367-9539, with any information or recommendations concerning this Cultural Impact Assessment.

Sincerely yours,

Laura McCarty, Senior Archaeologist

Enclosures (2)
Dear Mr. Maxwell,

Scientific Consulting Services, Inc. (SCS) has been retained by Group 70 International to conduct a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) of land parcel consisting of 77 acres in Kīhei, Ka‘ūpuna, Kōlōkolo, and Waikīkī condo, Mākena District, Maui Island. The parcel is being developed into a high school and will include a library, administration, athletics, and athletic fields. According to documents supplied by Group 70, the project area is planned for the development of a new high school and will include a library, administration, athletics, and athletic fields.

According to the Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts (Office of Environmental Quality Control, Nov. 1976), the types of cultural practices and beliefs subject to assessment may include subsistence, commercial, residential, agricultural, recreational, religious, spiritual, and cultural activities. The types of cultural resources subject to assessment may include traditional cultural properties or other types of historic sites, both natural and man-made, which support such cultural beliefs. We are asking for any information that might assist us in gathering knowledge of such activities, or other resources that might be impacted by development of the property. The results of our assessment will be used to determine the relevance and significance of such cultural resources.

We are requesting any information that might assist us in gathering knowledge of traditional activities, or other resources that might be impacted by development of the property. The results of our assessment will be used to determine the relevance and significance of such cultural resources. Please contact me at our office in Kīhei at (808) 572-1182, or my cell phone, (808) 675-9032, with any information or recommendations concerning this Cultural Impact Assessment. Sincerely yours,

Leslie McTavish, Senior Archaeologist

Enclosure (2)
March 18, 2010

Dear Mr. Kapudnie:

Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. (SCS) has been contracted by G2p 70 International to conduct a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) of land parcels consisting of 77 acres in Kihei, Kīhei A, Kīhei B, and Wailea Alii Estates, Mākena District, Maui Island. According to documents supplied by G2p 70 International, the project area is planned for the development of a new high school and will include a library, auditorium, commons, administration building, industrial arts building, ROTC facility, physical education and athletic buildings, gymnasium, and bleachers.

According to the Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impact (Office of Environmental Quality Control, Nov. 1997):

The types of cultural practices and beliefs subject to assessment may include subsistence, commercial, residential, agricultural, access-related, recreational, and religious or spiritual customs. The types of cultural resources subject to assessment may include traditional cultural properties or other types of historic sites, both man-made and natural, which support such cultural beliefs.

We are asking you for any information that might assist us in gathering knowledge of traditional activities or traditional rights that might be impacted by development of the property. The results of our assessment rely greatly on the assistance and support of individuals and organizations such as you. Enclosed are maps showing the proposed project area. Please contact me at our SCS Honolulu office at (808) 597-1182 or my cell phone (222-2355) or home (808) 877-8639, with any information or recommendations concerning this Cultural Impact Assessment.

Sincerely yours,

Leann McGarry, Senior Archaeologist

March 18, 2010

County of Maui
Department of Planning
Cultural Resources Commission
230 S. High Street
Wailuku, HI 96793

Dear Sir or Madam:

Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. (SCS) has been contracted by G2p 70 International to conduct a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) of land parcels consisting of 77 acres in Kihei, Kīhei A, Kīhei B, and Wailea Alii Estates, Mākena District, Maui Island. According to documents supplied by G2p 70 International, the project area is planned for the development of a new high school and will include a library, auditorium, commons, administration building, industrial arts building, ROTC facility, physical education and athletic buildings, gymnasium, and bleachers.

According to the Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impact (Office of Environmental Quality Control, Nov. 1997):

The types of cultural practices and beliefs subject to assessment may include subsistence, commercial, residential, agricultural, access-related, recreational, and religious or spiritual customs. The types of cultural resources subject to assessment may include traditional cultural properties or other types of historic sites, both man-made and natural, which support such cultural beliefs.

We are asking you for any information that might assist us in gathering knowledge of traditional activities or traditional rights that might be impacted by development of the property. The results of our assessment rely greatly on the assistance and support of individuals and organizations such as you. Enclosed are maps showing the proposed project area. Please contact me at our SCS Honolulu office at (808) 597-1182 or my cell phone (222-2355) or home (808) 877-8639, with any information or recommendations concerning this Cultural Impact Assessment.

Sincerely yours,

Leann McGarry, Senior Archaeologist

Enclosures (2)
Dear Sirs:

Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. (SCS) has been contracted by Group 70 International to conduct a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) of land parcels consisting of 77 acres in Koke'e, Kilauea, Kilauea, and Waialea, Kauai District, Kauai Island (TMIK2-2-2003:015 per 1.5 and 015 per 2). According to the documents supplied by Group 70 International, the parcel area is planned for the development of a new high school and will include a library, auditorium, cafeteria, administration building, industrial arts building, ROTC facility, physical education and athletic facilities, gymnasium, and bleachers.

According to the Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impact (Office of Environmental Quality Control, Nov. 1997):

The types of cultural practices and beliefs subject to assessment may include subsistence, commercial, residential, agricultural, access-related, recreational, and religious and spiritual contexts. The types of cultural resources subject to assessment may include traditional cultural properties or other types of historic sites both man-made and natural which support such cultural beliefs.

We are asking you for any information that might assist us in gathering knowledge of traditional activities, traditional beliefs that might be impacted by development of the property. The results of our assessments rely greatly on the assistance and response of individuals and organizations such as you. Enclosed are maps showing the proposed project area. Please contact us at our Honolulu office at (808) 597-1132, or via cell phone, (808) 222-2305 or home, (808) 637-9399, with any information or recommendations concerning this Cultural Impact Assessment.

Sincerely yours,

Leiataua McGeary, Senior Archaeologist

P. O. Box 5018
Kilauea, Kauai, HI 96751

March 18, 2010

Dear Sirs:

Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. (SCS) has been contracted by Group 70 International to conduct a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) of land parcels consisting of 77 acres in Koke'e, Kilauea, Kilauea, and Waialea, Kauai District, Kauai Island (TMIK2-2-2003:015 per 1.5 and 015 per 2). According to the documents supplied by Group 70 International, the parcel area is planned for the development of a new high school and will include a library, auditorium, cafeteria, administration building, industrial arts building, ROTC facility, physical education and athletic facilities, gymnasium, and bleachers.

According to the Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impact (Office of Environmental Quality Control, Nov. 1997):

The types of cultural practices and beliefs subject to assessment may include subsistence, commercial, residential, agricultural, access-related, recreational, and religious and spiritual contexts. The types of cultural resources subject to assessment may include traditional cultural properties or other types of historic sites both man-made and natural which support such cultural beliefs.

We are asking you for any information that might assist us in gathering knowledge of traditional activities, traditional beliefs that might be impacted by development of the property. The results of our assessments rely greatly on the assistance and response of individuals and organizations such as you. Enclosed are maps showing the proposed project area. Please contact us at our Honolulu office at (808) 597-1132, or via cell phone, (808) 222-2305 or home, (808) 637-9399, with any information or recommendations concerning this Cultural Impact Assessment.

Sincerely yours,

Leiataua McGeary, Senior Archaeologist

P. O. Box 5018
Kilauea, Kauai, HI 96751

March 18, 2010
APPENDIX B: BURIAL NOTICES
STATE OF HAWAII
County of Maui

Rhonda M. Kurohara being duly sworn
deposes and says that she is in the Advertising Sales
of the Maui Publishing Co., Ltd., publisher of THE MAUI NEWS, a
newspaper published in Wailuku, County of Maui, State of Hawaii;

that the order publication as to

CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT NOTICE

of which she annexed in a true and correct printed notice, was
published 3 times in THE MAUI NEWS, aforesaid, commencing
on the 20th day of March, 2010, and ending
on the 31st day of March, 2010, (both days
inclusive), i.e., on
March 20, 30, 31, 2010

and that she is not a party to or in any way interested in the above
mentioned matter.

This 1 page cultural impact, dated
March 20, 30, 31, 2010,
was subscribed and sworn to before me this 2/24 day of
March, 2010, in the Second Circuit of the State of Hawaii,

Rhonda M. Kurohara
Notary Public, Second Judicial
Circuit, State of Hawaii

My commission expires 09-29-11

B2 CC
STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
STATE GEOLGY, GEOLOGY DIVISION
AND KAUAI LAND USE DIVISION

April 19, 2019

Ms. Leticia McGerty, Senior Archaeologist
47-10484 Kahekili Hwy, Suite 958
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Ms. McGerty,

SUBJECT: Request for Information Regarding a Cultural Impact Assessment of 77 Acres Located at Kekaha, Kaua‘i County, Kaua‘i 864, and Waahelo Ahekua’s, Makawao District, Island of Maui, HI, (1) 2-3-002, 954

This is in response to your request for any information that may assist your firm in gathering knowledge of traditional cultural activities and/or traditional cultural rights that may be impacted by the development of the above property.

Kekaha has several active community organizations who may be helpful by talking to their membership, such as the Neighboredhood Board or similar entity, or the Kekaha Civic Club of the area (the Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs for information of all chapters). You might find some leads to acquiring any ASR or CIAA of nearby areas (i.e., Hana Chamber of Commerce and the local Kekaha weekly newspaper) that list community events and other relevant information.

The following may be able to share more useful info for folks who may be helpful:
1. Mrs. Nanida Pugno
   Phone: 808-374-6977
2. Kaua‘i Lions Club
   Contact: Native Intelligence
   Website: etc.
3. Maui Office of Hawaiian Affairs
   Phone: 808-373-5585
4. Maui Office of Hawaiian Affairs
   Phone: 808-373-5585

Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact our SHPO Cultural Historian, Mr. Hanno Rodriguez (808-544-8480).

Sincerely,

Phyllis Concas Craig
Hispanic and Culture Branch Chief

cc: Mr. Illino Rodríguez, SHPD Cultural Historian

April 12, 2019

Leutes McGerty
Senior Archaeologist
47-10484 Kahekili Hwy, Suite 958
Honolulu, HI 96813

RE: Cultural Impact Assessment consultation
Kekaha, Kaua‘i County, Kaua‘i 864 Project
Waahelo Ahekua’s
Tax Map Key: (1) 2-3-002, 954, (1) 2-3-002, 954

Aloha Ms. McGerty:

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) is in receipt of your March 12, 2019 letter and associated comments and request for consultation regarding the cultural resources on the island of Maui, in the area of Makawao District, on the above tax parcel parcel mentioned above.

According to your letter, the project area is planned for the development of a new high school and will include a library, auditorium, cafeteria, administrative building, industrial arts building, ROTC facility, physical education and athletic building, gymnasium, and bleachers. OHA applauds your efforts to perform an Archaeological Inventory Survey Report in connection with this project and requests information or a summary of your findings.

OHA also applauds your recent public notice in the April edition of the Ka Wai Ola. We appreciate your attempt to reach out to the community and to anyone who might have an interest or can provide assistance in addressing cultural issues, concerns, or cultural practices, beliefs, and traditions in this area. We will also agree to work with your list of contacts and are confident we will provide you with the information you need to move forward with your consultation process.
Thank you for initiating consultation at this early stage and we look forward to the opportunity to review the completed assessment. Should you have any questions, please contact: Kailua Kona at 594-0272 or kathy@ots.org.

O wai la o a la 'ala"o.

Chad W. Norton
Chief Executive Officer

C: Ohe-Maui Community Resources Coordinator