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June 10, 2018

Susan Lebo, Ph.D.
Archaeology Branch Chief
DLNR-SHPD
601 Kamokila Blvd, Room 555
Kapolei, HI 96707
Email: susan.a.lebo@hawaii.gov

Subject: Archaeological Field Inspection of TMK: (3) 1-5-059:059, Kea’au Ahupua’a, Puna District, Island of Hawai’i.

Dear Susan:

At the request of Monica and Kevin Barry (landowners), in support of a district boundary amendment application being submitted to the State of Hawai’i Land Use Commission (LUC), ASM Affiliates (ASM) conducted an Archaeological Field Inspection of a 0.51-acre parcel (TMK: (3) 1-5-059:059) located in Hawaiian Paradise Park (HPP), Kea’au Ahupua’a, Puna District, Island of Hawai’i (Figures 1, 2, and 3). The landowner is seeking to reclassify the subject parcel from Conservation land to Agricultural land. According to the LUC’s district boundary amendment, “On petitions to redistrict Conservation lands, the requirements of the EIS law (Chapter 343, HRS) must be met before the petition to reclassify Conservation land can be officially accepted as a proper filing and acted upon by the Commission.” This Archaeological Field Inspection is intended to fulfill the Section 6E-42 requirements of Hawai’i Revised Statutes (HRS) Chapter 343, and was prepared according to Hawai’i Administrative Rules (HAR) 13§13-284 and 275. The purpose of the archaeological field inspection was to determine if any historic properties could potentially be impacted by the redistricting of the parcel from Conservation land to Agricultural Land.

Parcel 059, the subject parcel, is also identified as Lot 463 of Block 10 of the Hawaiian Paradise Park subdivision, which was created in 1959 when roughly 9,850 acres of coastal Kea’au Ahupua’a, and the neighboring ahupua’a of Waikahekahe Nui and Iki, were subdivided into nearly 8,900 parcels. The subject property is located along the eastern side of Kaloli Point makai of Paradise Ala Kai Street. It is bounded to the west by the paved roadway, to the north by a developed residential property, to the east by the Pacific Ocean, and to the south by an undeveloped residential parcel. The subject parcel is one of a few conservation-zoned parcels remaining in HPP (Figure 4). Most of the neighboring parcels were converted from conservation to agriculturally-zoned land soon after the subdivision was created. The original owner of Parcel 059 could not be located at the time of the original district boundary amendment filing, so the subject parcel’s zoning was never converted.

Description of Subject Property

The subject property is situated on a 200 to 750 year old lava flow that originated from Kīlauea Volcano (Sherrod et al. 2007). Soil within the general study area is classified as Ophihikao highly decomposed plant material, consisting of a well-drained, thin organic soil overlying pāheohoe lava bedrock (Sato et al. 1973). This part of Hawai’i island has a mean annual rainfall of 124 inches (3,156.5 millimeters) and a mean annual temperature of 73°F (Juvik and Juvik 1998). Vegetation across the subject parcel is quite thick. The parcel is fronted at Paradise Ala Kai Street by a tall growth of grass (Figure 5). The grass transitions fairly quickly, however, to a dense, secondary growth of weeds, ferns, small trees, and vines that cover most of the mauka half of the property (Figure 6), and obscure a ground surface that is crisscrossed by relatively recently felled, large ironwood trees. Near the coastal margin of the property, the vegetation transitions to beach naupaka (Scaevola sericea) with some small ironwood trees (Casuarina equisetifolia) and coconut...
palms (*Cocos nucifera*) also growing (Figure 7). The parcel is fronted at the coast by a wave and windswept shelf of pāhoehoe bedrock and a low cliff (Figures 8 and 9).

**Culture-Historical Background for Kea‘au**

The subject parcel is located within Kea‘au Ahupua‘a, a land unit of the District of Puna, one of six major districts on the island of Hawai‘i. The *ahupua‘a* of Kea‘au is one of fifty traditional land divisions found in the *moku* (district) of Puna on the eastern shores of Hawai‘i Island. The Hawaiian proverb “Puna, mai ‘Oki’okihihi a Māwae” describes the extent of the district spanning from ‘Oki’okihihi the southern boundary, to Māwae, the northern boundary. In the book, *Native Planters in Old Hawaii*, Handy and Handy (1991) describe Puna as an agriculturally fertile land that has repeatedly been devastated by lava flows. Writing during the 1930s, they relate that:

> The land division named Puna—one of the six chiefdoms of the island of Hawaii said to have been cut ('oki) by the son and successor of the island’s first unifier, Umi-a-Liloa—lies between Hilo to the north and Ka‘u to the south, and it projects sharply to the east as a great promontory into the Pacific. Kapoho is its most easterly point, at Cape Kumukahi. The uplands of Puna extend back toward the great central heights of Mauna Loa, and in the past its lands have been built, and devastated, and built again by that mountain’s fires. In the long intervals, vegetation took hold, beginning with miniscule mosses and lichens, then ferns and harder shrubs, until the uplands became green and forested and good earth and humus covered much of the lava-strewn terrain, making interior Puna a place of great beauty...

> ...One of the most interesting things about Puna is that Hawaiians believe, and their traditions imply that this was once Hawaii’s richest agricultural region and that it is only in relatively recent time that volcanic eruption has destroyed much of its best land. Unquestionably lava flows in historic times have covered more good gardening land here than in any other district. But the present desolation was largely brought about by the gradual abandonment of their country by Hawaiians after sugar and ranching came in... (Handy and Handy 1991:539-542)

As suggested in the above passage, Puna was a region famed in legendary history for its associations with the goddess Pele and god Kāne (Maly 1998). Because of the relatively young geological history and persistent volcanic activity the region’s association with Pele has been a strong one. However, the association with Kāne is perhaps more ancient. Kāne, ancestor to both chiefs and commoners, is the god of sunlight, fresh water, verdant growth, and forests (Puku‘i 1983). It is said that before Pele migrated to Hawai‘i from Kahiki, there was “no place in the islands... more beautiful than Puna” (Puku‘i 1983:11). Contributing to that beauty were the groves of fragrant *hala* and forests of ‘ōhi’a lehua for which Puna was famous, and the inhabitants of Puna were likewise famous for their expertise and skill in lauhala weaving.

In Precontact and early Historic times the people of Puna lived primarily in small settlements along the coast with access to fresh water, where they subsisted on marine resources and agricultural products. According to McEldowney (1979), six coastal villages were traditionally present between Hilo and Cape Kumukahi (Kea‘au or Hā‘ena, Maku‘u, Waiaikahiula, Honolulu, Kahuwai, and Kula or Ko‘a‘e). The current study area is located between Hā‘ena and Maku‘u Villages. As described by McEldowney, each of the villages:

> ...seems to have comprised the same complex of huts, gardens, windbreaking shrubs, and utilized groves, although the form and overall size of each appear to differ. The major differences between this portion of the coast and Hilo occurred in the type of agriculture practiced and structural forms reflecting the uneven nature of the young terrain. Platforms and walls were built to include and abut outcrops, crevices were filled and paved for burials, and the large numbers of loose surface stones were arranged into terraces. To supplement the limited and often spoty deposits of soil, mounds were built of gathered soil, mulch, sorted sizes of stones, and in many circumstances, from burnt brush and
surrounding the gardens. Although all major cultigens appear to have been present in these gardens, sweet potatoes, ti (Cordyline terminalis), noni (Morinda citrifolia), and gourds (Lagenaria siceraria) seem to have been more conspicuous. Breadfruit, pandanus, and mountain apple (Eugenia malaccensis) were the more significant components of the groves that grew in more disjunct patterns than those in Hilo Bay. (McEldowney 1979:17)

*Ka Moʻoʻelelo O Hiʻiakaiapoliopiopele* (The story of Hi‘iakaiapoliopiopele), initially published in the Hawaiian language newspaper *Ka Na‘i Aupuni* between the years 1905-1906 (Hōʻoulu māhāliehie 2006), tells a story of Pele and her siblings that takes place at Hāʻena not far from the current study area. The story relates that after settling on Hawai‘i Island, Pele and her siblings ventured down to Hāʻena in Kea‘au to bathe in the sea. While there, Pele was overcome with the desired to sleep. She informed her youngest sister, Hi‘iaka not to allow any of their siblings to awaken her. Hi‘iaka consented to her sister’s commands. In her dream state, Pele followed the sound of a pahu (drum), which carried her spirit to the island of Kaua‘i, where she saw and met a striking man named Lohi‘au. The two met and fell madly in love, however, given that Pele was in her spirit form, she made it clear to Lohi‘au that she must return to Hawai‘i Island. Pele’s long sleep was cause for concern and although tempted to awaken her sister, Hi‘iaka held true to her sister’s commands.

When she awoke, Pele called upon each of her sisters and made a proposition, asking which one of them would fetch her dream lover Lohi‘au from Kaua‘i. Knowing Pele’s tempestuous temper, each feared possible repercussions and refused to go, except for her youngest sister, Hi‘iaka. Pele demanded that Hi‘iaka travel to Kaua‘i to fetch Lohi‘au, and sent her on her way with strict instructions; Hi‘iaka was not to take him as her husband, she was not to touch him, and she was to take no longer than forty days on her journey. While Hi‘iaka agreed to her sister’s demands, she realized that in her absence, Pele would become incensed with a burning and vehement fury and destroy whatever he desired. So Hi‘iaka set forth two stipulations of her own; her beloved ‘ōhi’a lehua grove in Puna was to be spared from destruction, and Pele was to protect her dear friend Hōpo‘e in her absence. In this version of the story, Hōpo‘e is described as a young girl from Kea‘au who was skilled at riding the surf of Hā‘ena, and who was the one who taught Hi‘iaka the art of hula. Pele agreed to Hi‘iaka’s requests, and Hi‘iaka departed on her journey to retrieve Pele’s lover. In a sympathetic act, Pele bestowed supernatural powers upon Hi‘iaka so that she would be protected against the dangers she would undoubtedly meet along the way.

Hi‘iaka hadn’t yet ventured very far on her journey when she realized that the volcano had begun to smoke thickly, trailing lava towards Hōpo‘e’s home of Kea‘au. It was not long before the smolder of smoke burst into a scorching fire. Despite being filled with a sense of dread, sensing that her sister had betrayed her promise, Hi‘iaka continued her journey. At last, Hi‘iaka found Lohi‘au, unfortunately, all that remained of him was his lifeless corpse. Keenly aware that she could not return Lohi‘au to her sister in such a state, Hi‘iaka used her healing powers to return his wandering spirit back into his body.

By this time, because of the amount of time taken by Hi‘iaka, Pele was furious. She shook the earth with great ferocity and heaved her lava in a torrent of devastation, annihilating Hi‘iaka’s ‘ōhi‘a lehua forest, obliterating all of Puna, and finally consuming Hōpo‘e as she lingered by the sea. In her death, Hōpo‘e was transformed into a stone at the coast of Kea‘au; a stone, carefully balanced alongside the sea, that would dance gracefully when touched by the soft breeze or the rumbling of the earth. Hi‘iaka, her heart bitter with her sister’s betrayal, brought Lohi‘au back to Puna as she swore she would. There, enraged by her sister’s spiteful acts, Hi‘iaka fought a brutal battle with Pele. Fearing that the two sisters would destroy the entire island, the elder gods finally intervened and ended the battle.

A map prepared in 1930, and filed with Land Court Application 1053 (Figures 10), labels the coastal lands on the eastern side of Kaloli Point as “Hōpo‘e,” suggesting that the events of *Ka Moʻoʻelelo O Hi‘iakaiapoliopiopele* (Hō‘oulu māhāliehie 2006) may have occurred in the general vicinity of the subject parcel. The stone believed to be Hi‘iaka’s companion, Hōpo‘e, was moved by a tsunami in 1946 (Pukui et al. 1974:52), and no longer dances along the shore of Kea‘au Ahupua‘a.
In 1823, British missionary William Ellis and members of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) toured the island of Hawai‘i seeking out communities in which to establish church centers for the growing Calvinist mission. Ellis recorded observations made during this tour in a journal (Ellis 2004). Walking southwest to northeast along the southeastern shore of the District of Puna with his missionary companions Asa Thurston and Artemas Bishop, Ellis’ writings present descriptions of residences and practices in the district, and provide the first written description of Kea‘au (or Hā‘ena) Village and its environs:

...The country was populous, but the houses stood singly, or in small clusters, generally on the plantations, which were scattered over the whole country. Grass and herbage were abundant, vegetation in many places luxuriant, and the soil, though shallow, was light and fertile.

Soon after 5 P.M., we reached Kaau [Kea‘au], the last village in the division of Puna. It was extensive and populous, abounding well with cultivated plantations of taro, sweet potatoes, and sugar-cane, and probably owes its fertility to a fine rapid stream, which, descending from the mountains, runs through it into the sea. (Ellis 2004:296)

When Ellis visited Puna, less than fifty years after the arrival of the first Europeans, the population of Hawai‘i was already beginning to decline (Maly 1998). By the mid-nineteenth century, the ever-growing population of Westerners in the Hawaiian Islands forced socioeconomic and demographic changes that promoted the establishment of a Euro-American style of land ownership, and the Māhele ‘Āina (Land Division) of 1848 became the vehicle for determining the ownership of native lands within the island kingdom. During the Māhele, native tenants of the lands could also claim, and acquire title to, kuleana parcels that they actively lived on or farmed. As a result of the Māhele, Kea‘au Ahupua‘a was awarded to William C. Lunalilo (the future, and first elected, monarch of the Hawaiian Islands) as ‘āpana (lot) 16 of LCAw. 8559B. Kea‘au was one of sixty-five ahupua‘a maintained by Lunalilo following the Māhele. In Puna, very few claims for kuleana were submitted. Maly (1998:37) notes that, with the exception of the islands of Kaho‘olawe and Ni‘ihau, no other land division of comparable size, had fewer claims for kuleana from native tenants than the district of Puna. Only two kuleana (LCAw. 2327 to Barenaba and LCAw. 8081 to Hewehe) were awarded within Kea‘au Ahupua‘a, neither of which was in close proximity to the current study area (Maly 1999).

Although exposed to missionary presence since the 1820s, early pre-Māhele narratives portray Puna as a district still heavily rooted in tradition, being only marginally impacted by foreign influence. While earlier narratives describe the region as densely populated with settlement locales present at both coastal and inland settings, subsequent accounts reveal a sharp decline in the native population throughout the nineteenth century, with Hawaiians maintaining marginalized communities outside of the central population centers. Within a quarter of a century, Puna’s population deteriorated by more than half from 4,800 in 1835 to 2,158 in 1860 (Anderson 1865), and continued decreasing to a mere 1,043 by 1878, reaching an unsurpassed low of 944 by 1884 (Thrumin 1885 and 1886). Lifeways for the Hawaiian population still residing in Puna underwent drastic changes during the second half of the nineteenth century, as the traditional villages and subsistence activities were mostly abandoned.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, Puna was on the verge of major economic growth, spurred by the booming sugar and lumber industries. Increasing urbanization of Puna, and particularly Kea‘au, were initially propelled by the sale of the ahupua‘a to William Herbert (W.H.) Shipman, J. Eldarts, and Samuel Damon by the King Lunalilo Estate in 1882. Campbell and Ogburn (1992) relate that with land leased from Shipman, a small group of investors (B.F. Dillingham, Lorin A. Thurston, Alfred W. Carter, Samuel M. Damon) created and developed the ‘Olaila Sugar Company, which operated on lands mauka of the current study area between 1899 and 1984. The current study area was too rocky for the cultivation of sugarcane, and was used by the Shipman family as ranch/grazing land until the late 1950s, when it subdivided into the Hawaiian Paradise Park subdivision and sold in many small pieces to individual owners.
Prior Archaeological Studies

Records on file at DLNR-SHPD indicate that 22 parcels within the Hawaiian Paradise Park subdivision (totaling 22 acres) have been previously surveyed for archaeological sites. Twenty-one parcels were surveyed by Haun and Henry (2013a, 2013b, 2013c) and the twenty-second parcel was surveyed by Higelmire and Lash (2017). Each of these studies, conducted at locations inland of the current study area, reported negative findings with regards to the presence of archaeological sites and features.

A survey of coastal lands within Kea‘au Ahupua‘a, conducted by Lass (1997) along the route of the Old Government Road to the northwest of HPP, identified fifteen archaeological sites including the Old Government Road/Puna Trail (Site 50-10-36-21273), which once passed inland of the current study area (Figure 10), along with numerous rock walls, enclosures, rock piles, modified bedrock features, and several concrete structures (Sites 50-10-36-21259 to 21273) (Figure 11). These sites were interpreted as having been used for Precontact to early Historic Period habitation, burial, and agricultural purposes, Historic ranching purposes, and World War II-era coastal defense purposes. Although not previously recorded, it is likely that similar sites were once common along the coast of HPP as well, prior to the development of the subdivision roads and lots.

Field Inspection

On June 6, 2018, Matthew R. Clark, M.A., conducted an archaeological field inspection of the 0.51-acre subject parcel. Walking a meandering transect from east to west (from Paradise Ala Kai Street to the coast) across the 80-foot wide by 265-foot long study area, the surface of the parcel was examined for the presence of historic properties. Fallen trees and thick vegetation covering the maauk portion of the property limited ground visibility in that area, but the visibility improved in the naupaka covered area at the seaward end of the parcel, and was excellent on the coastal bedrock shelf fronting the property. No archaeological resources of any kind were observed on the surface of the subject parcel during the field inspection, and the likelihood of encountering subsurface resources is extremely remote given the exposed bedrock ground surface. Based on the negative findings of the field investigation, on behalf of our client, we are requesting that DLNR-SHPD issue a written determination of “no historic properties affected” in accordance with HAR 13§13-284-5(b)1, with respect to the proposed district boundary amendment.

Sincerely,

Matthew R. Clark, M.A.
Principal Archaeologist
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Figure 1. Subject parcel location.
Figure 2. Tax Map Key (3) 1-5-059 with the subject parcel (059) indicated in red.

Figure 3. Aerial image showing the subject parcel (outlined in red).
Figure 4. Conservation-zoned lands in the vicinity of the subject parcel.

Figure 5. Vegetation within the subject parcel along Paradise Ala Kai Street, view to the east.
Figure 6. Vegetation within the *mauka* portion of the subject parcel, view to the east.

Figure 7. Vegetation within the *makai* portion of the subject parcel, view to the west.
Figure 8. Bedrock shelf fronting the subject parcel at the coast, view to the north.

Figure 9. Bedrock shelf fronting the subject parcel at the coast, view to the south.
Figure 10. Portion of Land Court Application 1053 Map 1 (prepared July 31, 1930 showing the coastal portion of Kea’au Ahupua’a with the locations of the Old Government Road and the subject parcel indicated.)
Figure 11. Location of archaeological sites previously recorded in Kae'au Ahupua'a along the route of the Old Government Road to the northwest of HPP (Lass 1997:Figure 2).