Pueo Project Survey Datasheet 2017

Site: UH West Siler GPS point: 28b GPS coordinates: (D.ddddddd, -D.ddddddd) 525177 2363571

Date: 9/26/17 Visit # (1, 2 or 3): 1 Survey Start Time: 5:35 Survey Stop Time: 6:30 Observers: JD

Temperature: 80° Cloud cover (Clear, PC, MC, Cloudy): PC Rain: None Wind (0-7): 0-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detection start time</th>
<th>Detection end time</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Initial distance</th>
<th>Initial direction</th>
<th>Sounds</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No detections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Habitat w/in 400 m or surveyed area (must be 100%):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Wetland</th>
<th>Agricultural Crops</th>
<th>Agricultural Dirt</th>
<th>Grassland Graded</th>
<th>Grassland Golf</th>
<th>Grassland Mowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grassland Fallow</td>
<td>Grasslands Tall &gt;75cm</td>
<td>Shrublands</td>
<td>Non Native Forest</td>
<td>Native Forest</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveyed area (max visible meters):

Observations: Lots of cattle and egrets onsite
**Pueo Project Survey Datasheet 2017**

**Site:** VH West Solar  
**GPS point:** Survey point  
**GPS coordinates:** (D.dddddd, D.dddddd)  
**0597017, 2363956 ± 0m**

**Date:** 3-26-19  
**Visit # (1, 2 or 3):**  
**Survey Start Time:** 5:15 pm  
**Survey Stop Time:** 6:50 pm  
**Observers:** Philip Taylor

**Temperature:** 82°F  
**Cloud cover (Clear, PC, MC, Cloudy):** PC  
**Rain:** 0  
**Wind (0-7):** 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detection start time</th>
<th>Detection end time</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Initial distance</th>
<th>Initial direction</th>
<th>Sounds</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**% Habitat w/in 400 m or surveyed area (must be 100%):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Wetland</th>
<th>Agricultural Crops</th>
<th>Agricultural Dirt</th>
<th>Grassland Grazed</th>
<th>Grassland Golf</th>
<th>Grassland Mowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grassland Fallow</td>
<td>Grasslands Tall &gt;75cm</td>
<td>Shrublands</td>
<td>Non Native Forest</td>
<td>Native Forest</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surveyed area (max visible meters):**

```
N: 250  S: 1000
NE: 600  SW: 500
E: 1000  W: 150
SE: 1000  NW: 700
```

**Observations:**  
Other species observed: Cattle egret, zebra dove, red-vented bulbul, red avadavat

Limited visibility after 6:40pm.
Pueo Project Survey Datasheet 2017

Site: UA West Solar

Western Point

GPS point: (286) GPS coordinates: (D.ddd, D.ddd)

Date: 11/14/17 Visit # (1, 2 or 3): 2 Survey Start Time: 4:30 PM Survey Stop Time: 6:17Observers: JD

Temperature: 78 Cloud cover (Clear, PC, MC, Cloudy): PC Rain: None Wind (0-7): 2 From South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detection start time</th>
<th>Detection end time</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Initial distance</th>
<th>Initial direction</th>
<th>Sounds</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Habitat within 400 m or surveyed area (must be 100%):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Wetland</th>
<th>Agricultural Crops</th>
<th>Agricultural Dirt</th>
<th>Grassland Grazed</th>
<th>Grassland Golf</th>
<th>Grassland Mowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grassland Fallow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grasslands Tall &gt;75 cm</td>
<td>Shrublands</td>
<td>Non Native Forest</td>
<td>Native Forest</td>
<td>Other Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveyed area (max visible meters):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: Good conditions, no detections
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Site: UH West  
GPS point:  
GPS coordinates (D.dddddd, -D.dddddd) 0597016, 2363956 ±3m

Date: 11-14-19  
Visit # (1, 2 or 3): 2  
Survey Start Time: 4:45p  
Survey Stop Time: 6:30p  
Observers: Philip Taylor

Temperature: 75°F  
Cloud cover (Clear, PC, MC, Cloudy): PC  
Rain: 0  
Wind (0-7): 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detection start time</th>
<th>Detection end time</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Initial distance</th>
<th>Initial direction</th>
<th>Sounds</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Habitat w/in 400 m or surveyed area (must be 100%):

Surveyed area (max visible meters):

Observations: No pueo observed. Barn owl heard inside structure at bottom of survey area.
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Site: VH West Solar  GPS point: (28)  GPS coordinates: (D.ddddddd, -D.ddddddd)  5965.7  2363571

Date: 17/1/19  Visit # (1, 2 or 3): 3  Survey Start Time: 4:35 PM  Survey Stop Time: 6:21 PM  Observers: JD

Temperature: 86°  Cloud cover (Clear, PC, MC, Cloudy): PC  Rain: None  Wind (0-7): 2-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detection start time</th>
<th>Detection end time</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Initial distance</th>
<th>Initial direction</th>
<th>Sounds</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Habitat w/in 400 m or surveyed area (must be 100%):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Wetland</th>
<th>Agricultural Crops</th>
<th>Agricultural Dirt</th>
<th>Grassland Grazed</th>
<th>Grassland Golf</th>
<th>Grassland Mowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grassland Fallow</td>
<td>Grasslands Tall &gt;75cm</td>
<td>Shrublands</td>
<td>Non Native Forest</td>
<td>Native Forest</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveyed area (max visible meters):

N: 400  S: 500+  NE: 500+ SE: 500+ W: 500+ NW: 400

Observations: A little breezy but overall good survey conditions.
# Pueo Project Survey Datasheet 2017

**Site:** UH West  
**GPS point:** East  
**GPS coordinates:** (Dddd.Dddd, -Dddd.Dddd)  
**Date:** 12/19/19  
**Visit # (1, 2 or 3):** 2  
**Survey Start Time:** 4:30p  
**Survey Stop Time:** 6:20p  
**Observers:** Phil Taylor

**Temperature:** 78°F  
**Cloud cover:** Clear  
**Rain:** 0  
**Wind (0-7):** 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detection start time</th>
<th>Detection end time</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Initial distance</th>
<th>Initial direction</th>
<th>Sounds</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**% Habitat w/in 400 m or surveyed area (must be 100%):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Wetland</th>
<th>Agricultural Crops</th>
<th>Agricultural Dirt</th>
<th>Grassshort Grazed</th>
<th>Grassshort Golf</th>
<th>Grassshort Mowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grassland Fallow</td>
<td>Grasslands Tall &gt;75cm</td>
<td>Shrublands</td>
<td>Non Native Forest</td>
<td>Native Forest</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surveyed area (max visible meters):**

- **N:** 200  
- **NE:** 500  
- **E:** 500  
- **SE:** 500  

**Observations:** No pueo observed.
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Management Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number(s)</td>
<td>Cultural Surveys Hawai‘i, Inc. (CSH) Job Code: HONOULIULI 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation Permit Number</td>
<td>CSH completed the archaeological inventory survey (AIS) fieldwork under archaeological fieldwork permit number 19-07, issued by the Hawai‘i State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) per Hawai‘i Administrative Rules (HAR) §13-13-282.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies</td>
<td>SHPD; Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP); Land Use Commission (LUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Jurisdiction</td>
<td>State of Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Proponent</td>
<td>AES Distributed Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Funding</td>
<td>AES Distributed Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>The project area is on undeveloped lands located in the southeastern foothills of the Wai‘anae Range, northeast of Pu‘u Makakilo and the Makakilo subdivision and about 600 m northwest of the intersection of the H-1 freeway and the Kualaka‘i Parkway. The project area is depicted on a portion of the Ewa and Schofield Barracks 2013 U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>The proposed AES West O‘ahu Solar project consists of construction and operation of an approximately 12.5 MW ground-mounted solar photovoltaic system, coupled with a 50 MWh battery energy storage system and related interconnection and ancillary facilities. Specifically, it includes the following major components: (1) solar photovoltaic system, (2) battery energy storage system, (3) substation and interconnection equipment, (4) a network of electrical wiring and collector lines, and (5) access roads and fencing. In addition to these facilities, the Project area would be made available for compatible agricultural activities. The solar photovoltaic system would consist of a series of solar modules mounted on a fixed-tilt racking system. The racking system would hold the modules at a fixed angle of 15 degrees facing toward the south and would be supported by steel posts, spaced approximately every 19 feet (5.8m) (varies). The posts would be installed using a hydraulic pile drive and/or augur for pre-drilling, with approximate depths of 6 feet (1.8m) (depending on soil conditions). In the event it is determined that the desired depth cannot be achieved, foundations would be pre-drilled and supported with concrete. Once mounted on the racking system, the highest point of the modules is expected to extend...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
approximately 8.5 feet (2.6m) above the ground surface, with an average of approximately 3 feet (0.9m) of ground clearance below the modules. Electrical equipment (including inverters and transformers) and the battery units (housed in containers) would be installed on concrete equipment pads distributed throughout the Project area. A total of five concrete pads would be installed; each approximately 2,800 square feet (260.1 m²) in area. The Project would also include a substation and associated electrical equipment to facilitate interconnection with the Hawaiian Electric grid. These facilities would be constructed immediately adjacent to the existing Hawaiian Electric ʻEwa Nui #42 46kV sub-transmission line and would occupy a total of approximately 7,800 square feet (724.6m²). A short overhead electrical connection (approximately 300 feet or 91.4m in length), supported by approximately three 60-foot or 18.3m tall wood poles, would also be installed. Electrical wiring and collector lines connecting the solar modules with the equipment pads and the substation would be installed underground: approximately 14,000 linear feet (4.267 km) of trenching would be required, with widths ranging between 5-10 feet (1.5m to 3.0m) and depths up to 4 feet (1.2m). Perimeter fencing and new access roads would also be installed within the Project area. Equipment to support compatible agricultural activities would include four beekeeping stations (each approximately 40 square feet or 3.7m²) and two cattle pens (each with a small concrete slab for a water trough). In addition to construction of the facilities described above, grading would also occur in localized areas as needed to smooth the ground surface and for other civil engineering purposes (e.g., stormwater retention and management).

**Project Acreage**

The project area is approximately 101.62 acres (41.12 hectares).

**Historic Preservation Regulatory Context**

This AIS investigation fulfills the requirements of HAR §13-276. The AIS was conducted to identify, document, and assess the significance of historic properties within the project area, assess the potential for the project to adversely affect significant historic properties, and to provide agreed upon mitigation commitments to address any adverse impacts. This document is intended to support the proposed project’s historic preservation review under Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS) §6E-42 and HAR §13-284, as well as the project’s environmental review under HRS §343. It is also intended to support any project-related historic preservation consultation with stakeholders such as state and county agencies and interested Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs) and community groups. The AIS investigation was designed in consultation with the SHPD.

An *Archaeological Inventory Survey of the University of Hawai‘i West O‘ahu Campus, District of ʻEwa, Island of O‘ahu, Hawai‘i (TMKs: 9-2-02:01, 03, and 05)* (Dega et al. 1998) that included the entirety of the University of Hawai‘i at West O‘ahu (UHW) campus provided the foundation for this AIS investigation.
present project area was previously accepted by SHPD on 3 February 1999 (LOG NO. 22959, DOC. NO. 9901EJ28; Appendix A). Due to the passage of time and given that the present project is different than that addressed by the 1998 report, it was agreed in consultation with Dr. Susan Lebo on 12 February 2019 that it would be appropriate to move forward with an AIS specific to this project.

Fieldwork Effort

CSH archaeologists Scott Belluomini, B.A., Alison Welser, M.A., Tyler Turran, B.A., Chris Konen, B.A., and David W. Shideler, M.A., conducted fieldwork between 4 and 6 February 2019 under the general supervision of Hallett H. Hammatt, Ph.D., Principal Investigator. This work required approximately 11 person-days to complete.

Following the initial pedestrian inspection, the project area boundaries were altered slightly, extending to the north and the west, as well as south to encompass the existing access roads to be used for the project. Additional pedestrian inspection was conducted for these areas on 12 December 2019.

Historic Properties Identified and Historic Property Significance

The AIS further documented two previously identified historic properties within the project area:

State Inventory of Historic Places (SIHP) # 50-80-08-5593 consists of an historic irrigation system and plantation infrastructure, including a mill building and pump station ("Pump Station 12"), bridges, troughs, transport ditches, culvert, pipes, culvert and sluice gate, and various other features related to water retention and movement. SIHP # 50-80-08-5593 was previously assessed by Dega et al. (1998) as significant under Hawai‘i State historic property significance Criteria a (be associated with events that have made an important contribution to the broad patterns of our history) and d (has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important for research on prehistory or history). The current study assesses SIHP # 50-80-08-5593 as significant under only HAR §13-284-6 Criterion d. This historic property has yielded information on land utilization and agricultural history of the ‘Ewa Plain. However, it is not associated with specific impactful events in the area, unlike the Waiahole Ditch, which immeasurably altered the entirety of the landscape. The historic property retains integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship.

SIHP # 50-80-09-2268 consists of the Waiahole Ditch System, previously assessed by various studies. The historic property is assessed as significant pursuant to HAR §13-284-6 under Criteria a (be associated with events that have made an important contribution to the broad patterns of our history), c (embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic value), and d (has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important for research on prehistory or history). The
Cultural Surveys Hawai‘i Job Code: HONOULIULI 171  Management Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Property</th>
<th>Effect Recommendations</th>
<th>Mitigation Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic property has yielded information on agricultural history of the area and contributed greatly to the development and evolution of the ‘Ewa Plain throughout its history. The historic property retains integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship. However, within the project area, the historic property only retains sufficient integrity of location, which is also diminished in portions of the project area due to erosion and neglect. While there are some portions that retain some integrity of design, materials, and workmanship within the project area, this integrity is diminished. The overall ditch is significant, however, the remnant portion of SIHP # 50-80-09-2268 within the project area does not retain sufficient integrity to be considered significant.</td>
<td>The portion of SIHP # 50-80-09-2268 within the project area does not retain sufficient integrity to be considered significant, and therefore no further work is recommended for the historic property. Sufficient information regarding the location, extent, function, and age of the portion of SIHP # 50-80-08-5593 within the project area have been generated by the current archaeological inventory survey investigation to mitigate any adverse effect caused by the proposed project. Pursuant to HAR §13-284-7, the project-specific effect determination is “no historic properties affected.”</td>
<td>The proposed project will have no effect on significant historic properties within the project area, therefore no mitigation is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 1  Introduction

1.1 Project Background

At the request of Tetra Tech, Inc., and on behalf of AES Distributed Energy, Cultural Surveys Hawai‘i, Inc. (CSH) has prepared this archaeological inventory survey report (AISR) for the AES West O‘ahu Solar project, Honouliuli Ahupua‘a, ‘Ewa District, O‘ahu, TMK: [1] 9-2-002:007 (por). The project area is 101.62 acres (41.12 hectares) of undeveloped lands in the southeastern foothills of the Wai‘anae Range, northeast of Pu‘u Makakilo and the Makakilo subdivision, and 600 m northwest of the intersection of the H-1 Freeway and the Kualaka‘i Parkway. The project area is depicted on a portion of the 2013 Ewa and Schofield Barracks U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (Figure 1), a tax map plat (Figure 2), and a 2018 aerial photograph (Figure 3).

1.2 Proposed Project Description

The proposed AES West O‘ahu Solar project consists of construction and operation of an approximately 12.5 MW ground-mounted solar photovoltaic system, coupled with a 50 MWh battery energy storage system and related interconnection and ancillary facilities (see Overall Site Plan, Figure 4). Specifically, it includes the following major components: (1) solar photovoltaic system, (2) battery energy storage system, (3) substation and interconnection equipment, (4) a network of electrical wiring and collector lines, and (5) access roads and fencing. In addition to these facilities, the Project area would be made available for compatible agricultural activities.

The solar photovoltaic system would consist of a series of solar modules mounted on a fixed-tilt racking system. The racking system would hold the modules at a fixed angle of 15 degrees facing toward the south and would be supported by steel posts, spaced approximately every 19 feet (5.8m) (varies). The posts would be installed using a hydraulic pile driver and/or augur for pre-drilling, with approximate depths of 6 feet (1.8m) (depending on soil conditions). In the event it is determined that the desired depth cannot be achieved, foundations would be pre-drilled and supported with concrete. Once mounted on the racking system, the highest point of the modules is expected to extend approximately 8.5 feet (2.6m) above the ground surface, with an average of approximately 3 feet (0.9m) of ground clearance below the modules. Electrical equipment (including inverters and transformers) and the battery units (housed in containers) would be installed on concrete equipment pads distributed throughout the Project area. A total of five concrete pads would be installed; each approximately 2,800 square feet (260.1 m²) in area. The Project would also include a substation and associated electrical equipment to facilitate interconnection with the Hawaiian Electric grid. These facilities would be constructed immediately adjacent to the existing Hawaiian Electric ‘Ewa Nui #42 46kV sub-transmission line and would occupy a total of approximately 7,800 square feet (724.6m²). A short overhead electrical connection (approximately 300 feet or 91.4m in length), supported by approximately three 60-foot or 18.3m tall wood poles, would also be installed. Electrical wiring and collector lines connecting the solar modules with the equipment pads and the substation would be installed underground; approximately 14,000 linear feet (4.267 km) of trenching would be required, with widths ranging between 5-10 feet (1.5m to 3.0m) and depths up to 4 feet (1.2m). Perimeter fencing and new access roads would also be installed within the Project area. Equipment to support compatible agricultural
Figure 1. Portion of the 2013 Ewa and Schofield Barracks USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles showing the location of the project area
Figure 2. Tax Map Key (TMK) [1] 9-2-002 showing the location of the project area (Hawai‘i TMK Service 2014)
Figure 3. Aerial photograph of the project area (Google Earth 2018)
Figure 4 AES West Oahu Overall Site Plan (supplied by client, dated 1/30/2019)

AIS for the AES West O'ahu Solar Project, Honouliuli, ‘Ewa, O'ahu
TMK: [1] 9-2-002:007 (por.)
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activities would include four beekeeping stations (each approximately 40 square feet or 3.7m²) and two cattle pens (each with a small concrete slab for a water trough). In addition to construction of the facilities described above, grading would also occur in localized areas as needed to smooth the ground surface and for other civil engineering purposes (e.g., stormwater retention and management).

1.1 Historic Preservation Regulatory Context and Document Purpose

The entire AES West O‘ahu Solar project area was previously addressed within an Archaeological Inventory Survey of the University of Hawai‘i West O‘ahu Campus, District of ‘Ewa, Island of O‘ahu, Hawai‘i (TMK 9-2-02:01, 9-2-02:03, 9-2-02:05) (Dega et al. 1998), which was accepted by the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) on 3 February 1999 (LOG NO. 22959, DOC. NO. 9901EJ28; Appendix A). Due to the passage of time and given that the present project is different than that addressed by the 1998 report, it was agreed in consultation with Dr. Susan Lebo on 12 February 2019 that it would be appropriate to move forward with an AIS specific to this project.

This AIS investigation fulfills the requirements of Hawai‘i Administrative Rules (HAR) §13-13-276. The AIS was conducted to identify, document, and assess the significance of historic properties within the project area, assess the potential for the project to adversely affect significant historic properties, and to provide agreed upon mitigation commitments to address any adverse impacts. This document is intended to support the proposed project’s historic preservation review under Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS) §6E-42 and HAR §13-284, as well as the project’s environmental review under HRS §343. It is also intended to support any project-related historic preservation consultation with stakeholders such as state and county agencies and interested Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs) and community groups. The AIS investigation was designed in consultation with the SHPD.

1.2 Environmental Setting

1.2.1 Natural Environment

The project area is in the southeast Wai‘anae Range at an elevation of approximately 280 to 640 feet (ft) above mean sea level. The Wai‘anae Range comprises the eroded remnant of a great shield volcano, dating back in origin to approximately 2.2 to 3.8 million years ago, now in the form of a long narrow ridge shaped by erosion (Macdonald et al. 1983:420, 303). Pu‘u Kapua‘i is 0.5 km to the northwest and Pu‘u Makakilo is 1.2 km to the southwest. These are understood as “very late cones [of the Wai‘anae volcano] […] composed of a varied mixture of cinder, spatter and lava flows” (Macdonald et al. 1983:429).

Topography of the area is moderately sloping. In terms of hydrology, the area is drained by two deeply dissected gulches, Kalo‘i Gulch 300 m to the southwest and Honouliuli Gulch 700 m to the northeast. These gulches at a comparable elevation are believed to rarely run with water. Historic maps indicate a spring located approximately 2.2 km to the north. Such infrequent springs may have been key to the early human activity on the southeast Wai‘anae slope. The project area is relatively dry with a mean annual rainfall at the neighboring Station Field 105 of 703 mm or 27.7 inches (Giambelluca et al. 2013). This rainfall would be marginal for non-irrigated agriculture. Average annual temperatures range from 38° to 75° Fahrenheit (Giambelluca et al. 2014).
According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) database (2001) and soil survey data gathered by Foote et al. (1972), the project area’s soils consist of Kawaihapai clay loam (KIB), 2 to 6% slopes (KIaB), Mahana silt clay loam, 6 to 12% slopes, eroded (McC2), Mahana silt clay loam, 12 to 20% slopes, eroded (McD2), Mahana silt clay loam, 20 to 35% slopes, eroded (McE2), Molokai silty clay loam, 7 to 15% slopes (MUC) and Molokai silty clay loam, 15 to 25% slopes (MUD) soils (Figure 5).

Kawaihapai series soils are described as follows:

This series consists of well-drained soils in drainageways and on alluvial fans on the coastal plains on the islands of Oahu and Molokai. These soils formed in alluvium derived from basic igneous rock in humid uplands. They are nearly level to moderately sloping. Elevations range from nearly sea level to 300 feet. The annual rainfall amounts to 30 to 50 inches. [...] These soils are used for sugarcane, truck crops, and pasture. The natural vegetation consists of kiawe, koa haole, lantana, and bermudagrass. [Foote et al. 1972:63–64]

Further, Kawaihapai clay loam, 2 to 6% slopes soils (KIB), are described as having slow runoff and a slight erosion hazard (Foote et al. 1972).

Kawaihapai stony clay loam, 2 to 6% slopes (KIaB) is described as similar to Kawaihapai clay loam, but with “enough stones to hinder, but not prevent cultivation. Runoff is slow, and the erosion hazard is slight” (Foote et al. 1972:64).

Mahana series soils are described as follows:

This series consists of well-drained soils on uplands on the islands of Kauai and Oahu. These soils developed in volcanic ash. They are gently sloping to very steep. Elevations range from 1,000 to 3,000 feet. The annual rainfall amounts to 30 to 45 inches. [...] These soils are used for pasture, woodland, wildlife habitat, irrigated sugarcane, and water supply. The natural vegetation consists of puakeawe, aalii, ricegrass, molassesgrass, silver oak, yellow foxtail, lantana, jocie, Japanese tea, passion flower, and associated plants. [Foote et al. 1972:85]

Mahana silt clay loam, 6 to 12% slopes, eroded (McC2) soils are described as follows:

This soil occurs on ridgetops and moderately sloping uplands [...] Permeability is moderately rapid. Runoff is slow, and the erosion hazard is slight. [...] In places roots penetrate to a depth of 5 feet or more. [...] This soil is used for pasture, woodland, wildlife habitat, pineapple, and sugarcane. [Foote et al. 1972:85–86]

Mahana silt clay loam, 12 to 20% slopes, eroded (McD2) soils, are described as having medium runoff and a moderate erosion hazard, used for pasture, woodland, wildlife habitat, and sugarcane (Foote et al. 1972).

Mahana silty clay loam, 20 to 35% slopes, eroded (McE2) soils are further described as follows:

Most of the surface layer has been removed by erosion. Runoff is very rapid, and the erosion hazard is very severe. Included in mapping were areas where all of the surface layer and part of the subsoil have been removed by erosion. Also included were small, stony areas and reddish-colored upland soils that are underlain by a
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Figure 5. ESRI Aerial Imagery (2016) with overlay of Soil Survey of the State of Hawaii (Foote et al. 1972; USDA SSURGO 2001), indicating soil types within and surrounding the project area.
panlike layer at a depth of 15 to 50 inches. This soil is used for pasture, pineapple, and irrigated sugarcane. [Foote et al. 1972:86]

Molokai series soils are described as follows:

This series consists of well-drained soils on uplands on the islands of Maui, Lanai, Molokai, and Oahu. These soils formed in material weathered from basic igneous rock. They are nearly level to moderately steep. Elevations range mainly from nearly sea level to 1,000 feet but are as much as 1,500 feet on Lanai. The annual rainfall amounts to 20 to 25 inches, most of which occurs between November and April […] These soils are used for sugarcane, pineapple, pasture, wildlife habitat, and homesites. The natural vegetation consists of kiawe, ilima, uhaloa, feather fingergrass, and buffelgrass. [Foote et al. 1972:96]

Molokai silty clay loam, 3 to 7% slopes (MuB) are further described as having slight to moderate erosion hazard with slow to medium runoff.

Molokai silty clay loam, 7 to 15% slopes (MUC) soils, are described as occurring on knoll slope breaks, with medium runoff and a moderate erosion hazard (Foote et al. 1972). This material is used for sugarcane, pineapple, pasture, wildlife habitat, and home sites (Foote et al. 1972).

Molokai silty clay loam, 15 to 25% slopes (MUD) soils are further described as follows:

This soil occurs on Oahu. In most places the slope does not exceed 20 percent. Runoff is medium, and the erosion hazard is severe. Workability is slightly difficult because of the slope. Included in mapping were small areas where boulder cores are exposed. This soil is used for sugarcane and pineapple. [Foote et al. 1972:97]

Today the project area is largely covered with haole koa (Leucaena leucocephala) and exotic grasses. Wiliwili (Erythrina sandwicensis), sweet acacia or klu (Acacia farnesiana), and kiawe (Prosopis pallida) were also observed within the project area.

1.2.2 Built Environment

The project area was utilized for commercial sugarcane from the early twentieth century into the late 1970s. Some of the sugarcane plantation infrastructure in the vicinity was relatively elaborate, with the Waiahole Ditch transporting irrigation water from windward O‘ahu into the foothills of the southern Wai‘anae Range. The sugarcane fields have remained fallow for decades. Some plantation infrastructure is still present in the form of cane haul roads and remnant irrigation features (see Figure 3). The project area is otherwise undeveloped. The H-1 Freeway is approximately 800 m south of the project area.
Section 2  Methods

2.1 Field Methods

Fieldwork was completed under archaeological fieldwork permit number 19-07, issued by the SHPD pursuant to HAR §13-282. CSH archaeologists Scott Belluomini, B.A., Chris Konen, B.A., Tyler Turran, B.A., and Alison Welser, M.A., conducted fieldwork between 4 and 6 February 2019 under the direction of project manager David W. Shideler, M.A., and general supervision of Hallett H. Hammatt, Ph.D., Principal Investigator. Following the initial pedestrian inspection, the project area boundaries were extended slightly to the north and the west, as well as south to encompass the existing access roads to be used for the project. Additional pedestrian inspection was conducted for these areas on 12 December 2019. This work required approximately 12 person-days to complete.

2.1.1 Pedestrian Survey

Archaeologists undertook a 100%-coverage pedestrian inspection of the project area for the purpose of historic property identification and documentation. The pedestrian survey was accomplished through systematic sweeps of four CSH archaeologists spaced approximately 10 to 15 m apart based on ground visibility. Archaeologists walked transects beginning at the north end of the project area down to the southern border, oriented southwest (Figure 6). Additionally, archaeologists walked the length of the Waiahole Ditch within the project area. Archaeologists recorded the general characteristics of the project area, including vegetation, and took general photographs of the project area. Only minimal vegetation clearance was attempted for the purpose of feature documentation and photography.

When potential historic properties were identified, archaeologists documented their locations. This included GPS data collection of the historic property and associated features. All surface features visible within the project area were photographed with a scale and generally described, which often included descriptions of dimensions, shape, materials, method of construction, integrity, general condition, and evidence of age and function of the feature. Plan maps were completed for features, as well as profiles and cross-sections when appropriate. Additionally, archaeologists documented areas of the historic properties outside the project area boundaries and photographed and noted construction methods and components of the ditch for an overall description of the historic property. Note that historic property extents were defined by a 1-m radius surrounding the documented portions of all identified features.

2.1.2 GPS Data Collection

The locations of all documented components of historic properties were recorded using a Trimble Pro XH mapping grade GPS unit with real-time differential correction. This unit provides sub-meter horizontal accuracy in the field. GPS field data was post-processed, yielding horizontal accuracy between 0.5 and 0.1 m. GPS location information was converted into GIS shape files using Trimble’s Pathfinder Office software, version 5.85, and graphically displayed using ESRI’s ArcGIS 10.6.1. CSH utilizes the NAD 83 HARN datum and UTM Zone 4N coordinate system.

In addition to feature locations, archaeologists recorded data points, which were also recorded on illustrated plan maps. For feature complexes, GPS points were taken at several data points, which were recorded on plan maps to assist in the accurate mapping of the horizontal extent of the
Figure 6. Aerial photograph showing the project area with overlay of two of four archaeologists’ GPS track logs (Google Earth 2018)
historic property. The data points were used to geo-reference the historic properties’ location using scaled illustrated maps and field notes.

2.2 Research Methods

Background research included a review of previous archaeological studies on file at the SHPD; review of documents at Hamilton Library of the University of Hawai‘i, the Hawai‘i State Archives, the Mission Houses Museum Library, the Hawai‘i Public Library, and the Bishop Museum Archives; study of historic photographs at the Hawai‘i State Archives and the Bishop Museum Archives; and study of historic maps at the Survey Office of the Department of Land and Natural Resources. Historic maps and photographs from the CSH library were also consulted. In addition, Māhele records were examined from the Waihona ‘Aina database (Waihona ‘Aina 2020). This research provided the environmental, cultural, historic, and archaeological background for the project area. The sources studied were used to formulate a predictive model regarding the expected types and locations of historic properties in the project area.

2.3 Disposition of Materials

No materials were collected during AIS fieldwork. All data generated during the course of the AIS are stored at the CSH office in Waimānalo, O‘ahu.
Section 3  Background Research

3.1 Traditional and Historical Background

The ahupua’a (traditional land division) of Honouliuli is the largest, in total land area, ahupua’a on the island of O’ahu. It stretches across 16,446.4 hectares (40,640 acres) from the summit of the Wai‘anae Range in the northwest, to the west shore of Pearl Harbor in the east. It is separated from the Pearl Harbor entrance channel and the ocean by Pu‘uloa Ahupua’a on its southeast side.

Honouliuli Ahupua’a, as a traditional land unit, had tremendous and varied resources available for exploitation by early Hawaiians. Within Honouliuli Ahupua’a, not only is there a long coastline fronting the normally calm waters of leeward O’ahu, but there are also 4 miles of waterfront along the west side of the West Loch of Pearl Harbor. The “karstic desert” and marginal characterization of the limestone plain, which is the most readily visible terrain, does not do justice to the ahupua’a as a whole. Although the ahupua’a was rich in resources in many locations, the upper-middle portion of the Honouliuli Ahupua’a, where the project area is located, has little recorded traditional use.

Traditional sources, the earliest maps, and early archaeological studies do not display much land use in this portion of Honouliuli Ahupua’a. Kalo’i Gulch, which courses just south of the project area, and Pu‘u Kapua‘i just to the northwest are the only Hawaiian-named land forms in the vicinity of the project area that have been documented (Figure 7). Pukui et al. (1974:77) translate the name “Ka-lo’i” to mean “the taro patch” and Sterling and Summers (1978:35) relate a number of vignettes regarding the “Waihuna” or “Punahuna” hidden spring associated with Kalo’i Gulch. Ida E.K. von Holt (in Sterling and Summers 1978:35) relates in the account of “two old Hawaiians” that the hidden spring “had been one of the principal sources of water for all that country, which was quite heavily populated before the smallpox epidemic of 1840.” “Pu’u Kapua‘i” is translated as “footprint hill” (Pukui et al. 1974:199) but the association with that name is unclear.

The political and cultural center of the ahupua’a is understood to have been the relatively dense settlement and rich lands for irrigated taro cultivation at the ‘ili (land division smaller than an ahupua’a) of Honouliuli, located where Honouliuli Stream empties into the north portion of West Loch (east of the current project area). The name of the ahupua’a, translated as “dark bay” (Pukui et al. 1974:51), may refer to the nature of the waters of West Loch at the mouth of Honouliuli Stream. Early accounts and maps indicate a large settlement at the ‘ili of Honouliuli. It is possible the political power of this village was so great it was able to extend its jurisdiction well to the northwest, into an area which might have been anticipated to fall under the dominion of the Wai‘anae ruling chiefs.

3.1.1 Mythological and Traditional Accounts

The traditions of Honouliuli Ahupua’a have been compiled and summarized in studies by Sterling and Summers (1978), Hammatt and Folk (1981), Kelly (1991), Charvet-Pond and Davis (1992), and Maly and Rosendahl (1993). Some of the themes of these traditions include connections with Kahiki (the traditional homeland of Hawaiians, probably in reference to central Polynesia) and the special character and relationship of the places known as Pu‘u ‘o Kapolei and Kualaka‘i.
Figure 7. Portion of a USGS Orthoimagery aerial photograph (2011) showing place names, trails and streams of Honouliuli Ahupua‘a with the location of the project area
Connections with Kahiki are found in numerous place names, traditional events, and in the beings associated with Honouliuli. There are several versions of Kaha‘i leaving from Kalaeloa for a trip to Kahiki to bring breadfruit back to ‘Ewa (Kamakau 1991:110). There are several stories that associate places in the region with Kamapua‘a and the Hina family, as well as with Pele’s sisters, all of whom have strong connections with Kahiki (Kamakau 1961:111; Pukui et al. 1974:200).

Pu‘u ‘o Kapolei (approximately 4 km southwest of the project area) was one of the more sacred places in Honouliuli (cf. Sterling and Summers 1978:33). Puʻu ‘o Kapolei is connected with Kahiki, as the hill is noted as the home of Kamapua‘a’s grandmother, Kamaunuaniho, the Kahiki ancestor to the people of O’ahu (Fornander 1916:5:318; Kahiolo 1978:81, 107). By name, Kapolei is associated with the goddess Kapo, another connection with the Pele and Kamapua‘a stories (Kamakau 1976:14).

McAllister (1933:108) records that a heiau (pre-Christian place of worship) was once located on Puʻu ‘o Kapolei, but was destroyed before his survey of 1930. The heiau may have been associated with the sun, as the hill was used as a point of solar reference or as a place where such observations were made (Fornander 1916:3:292). Puʻu ‘o Kapolei might have been understood as the gate of the setting sun. It is notable that the rising sun at the eastern gate of Kumukahi in Puna is associated with the Hawaiian goddess Kapo (Emerson 1978:41). There is little specific information for Puʻu ‘o Kapolei, but the place name itself (“hill of beloved Kapo”) is hard to ignore. It is mentioned in some cosmologies that Kū was the god of the rising sun, and Hina should be associated with the setting sun (Hina is the mother of Kamapua‘a). Fornander (1916:3:292) states, Puʻu ‘o Kapolei may have been a jumping off place (also connected with the setting sun) and associated with the dead who roamed the adjacent Plain of Kaupe‘a.

Puʻu ‘o Kapolei was the primary landmark for travelers between Pearl Harbor and the west O‘ahu coast, with a main trail running inland of it (‘Ī‘ī 1959:27, 29). Puʻu ‘o Kapolei was probably the most common name used as a reference for the area of the ‘Ewa Plain in traditional Hawai‘i (Fornander 1916:2:318; Nakuina 1992:54; E.M. Nakuina 1904 in Sterling and Summers 1978:34).

3.1.2 Early Historic Period

Early historical accounts indicate the ahupua‘a of Honouliuli was once widely inhabited by pre-Contact Hawaiian populations, including the Hawaiian ali‘i (chiefly class). This substantial population can largely be attributed to the plentiful marine and estuarine resources available at the coast, along which several sites interpreted as permanent habitations were located. Other attractive subsistence-related features of the ahupua‘a included irrigated lowlands suitable for wet land taro cultivation (Hammatt and Shideler 1990), as well as the lower forest area of the mountain slopes for the procurement of forest goods.

Exploitation of the forest resources along the slopes of the Wai‘anae Range—as suggested by E.S. and E.G. Handy—probably acted as a viable subsistence alternative during times of famine:

The length or depth of the valleys and the gradual slope of the ridges made the inhabited lowlands much more distant from the wao, or upland jungle, than was the case on the windward coast. Yet the wao here was more extensive, giving greater opportunity to forage for wild foods during famine time. [Handy and Handy 1972:469–470]
These upper valley slopes may have also been a significant resource for opportunistic quarrying of basalt for the manufacturing of stone tools. This is evidenced in part by the existence of a probable quarrying site (State Inventory of Historic Places [SIHP] # 50-80-12-4322) in Maka'awao Gulch at 152 m (500 ft) above mean sea level, west of the current project area (Hammatt et al. 1991).

The Hawaiian ali‘i were also attracted to the region. One historical account of particular interest refers to an ali‘i residing in Ko Olina, southwest of the current project area:

Ko Olina is in Waimanalo near the boundary of Ewa and Waianae. This was a vacationing place for chief Kakuhihewa and the priest Napuaikamao was the caretaker of the place. Remember reader, this Ko Olina is not situated in the Waimanalo on the Koolau side of the island but the Waimanalo in Ewa. It is a lovely and delightful place and the chief, Kakuhihewa loved this home of his. [Sterling and Summers 1978:41]

John Papa ‘Ī‘ī describes a network of Leeward O‘ahu trails (Figure 8 through Figure 10) which in later historic times encircled and crossed the Wai‘anae Range. These trails allowed passage from West Loch to the Honouliuli lowlands, past Pu‘u ‘o Kapolei and Waimānalo Gulch to the Wai‘anae coast and onward circumscribing the shoreline of O‘ahu (‘Īʻī 1959:96–98). The main trail along the south shore of O‘ahu would have been approximately 1.5 km to the southeast. A main trail extending up the central valley of O‘ahu would have been approximately 3 km to the east. The 1825 Malden map (see Figure 9) shows a trail extending from the main trail along the south shore of O‘ahu into the uplands in the Pālehua area, passing just a couple hundred meters to the southwest of the project area. The 1873 Alexander map (see Figure 10), one of the earliest detailed maps of the vicinity, shows no development near the project area.

Other early historical accounts of the general region typically refer to the more populated areas of the ‘Ewa district, where missions and schools were established, and subsistence resources were perceived to be greater. However, the presence of archaeological sites along the coral plains and coast of southwest Honouliuli Ahupua‘a indicate prehistoric and early historic populations also adapted to less inviting areas, despite the environmental hardships.

Subsequent to Western Contact in the area, the landscape of the ‘Ewa Plain and Wai‘anae slopes was adversely affected by the removal of the sandalwood and other trees, and the introduction of domesticated animals and new vegetation. Goats, sheep, and cattle were brought to the Hawaiian Islands by Vancouver in the early 1790s and allowed to graze freely about the land for some time after. L.A. Henke reports the existence of a longhorn cattle ranch in Wai‘anae by at least 1840 (Frierson 1972:10). During this time, perhaps as early as 1790, exotic vegetation species were introduced to the area. These typically included vegetation best suited to a terrain disturbed by the logging of sandalwood forest and eroded by animal grazing. The following dates for the introduction of exotic vegetation are given by R. Smith and outlined by Frierson (1972:10–11):

1. ‘early,’ c. 1790: for the establishment of Prickly pear cactus, (Opuntia tuna), Haole koa, (Leucaena leucocephala) and Guava (Psidium guajava)
2. 1835-1840: Burmuda [sic] grass (Cynodon dactylon) and Wire grass (Eleusine indica)
3. 1858: Lantana (Lantana camara)

The kiawe tree (Prosopis pallida) was also introduced during this period, either in 1828 or 1837 (Frierson 1972:11).
Figure 8. Portion of the 1810 Rockwood map of trails of Leeward Oʻahu with overlay of project area (Īʻī 1959:96)
Figure 9. Portion of 1825 Malden map of the South Coast of Oahu (RM 640) showing the location of the project area
Figure 10. Portion of 1873 Alexander map of Honouliuli (RM 405) showing trail network in vicinity of project area
3.1.3 The Māhele and the Kuleana Act

During the Māhele of 1848, 99 individual land claims in the *ahupua’a* of Honouliuli were registered and awarded by King Kamehameha III. No kuleana land claims were made for land within the current project area or vicinity. The vast majority of the Land Commission Awards (LCA) were located in Honouliuli near the taro lands of the ‘ili of Pu’u’ula and the Pu’u’ula Salt Works. The largest award (Royal Patent 6071, LCA 11216, ‘Āpana [parcel] 8) in Honouliuli Ahupua’a was granted to Miriam Ke‘ahi-Kuni Kekau‘onohi on January 1848 (Native Register 1848). Kekau‘onohi acquired a deed to all unclaimed land within the *ahupua’a*, including 43,250 acres encompassing the present project area.

Samuel Kamakau relates the following about Kekau‘onohi as a child:

> Kamehameha’s granddaughter, Ke-ahi-Kuni Kekau-ohi [...] was also a tabu chiefess in whose presence the other chiefesses had to prostrate and uncover themselves, and Kamehameha would lie face upward while she sat on his chest. [Kamakau 1961:208–209]

Kekau‘onohi was one of Liholiho’s (Kamehameha II’s) wives, and after his death, she lived with her half-brother, Luanu‘u Kahala‘i’a, who was governor of Kaua‘i (Kamakau 1961:20). Subsequently, Kekau‘onohi ran away with Queen Ka‘ahumanu’s stepson, Keli‘i-ahonui, and then became the wife of Chief Levi Ha‘alelea. Upon her death on 2 June 1851, all her property passed to her husband and his heirs. When Levi Ha‘alelea died, the property went to his surviving wife, who in turn leased it to James Dowsett and John Meek in 1871 for stock running and grazing.

3.1.4 Mid- to Late 1800s

In 1877, James Campbell purchased most of Honouliuli Ahupua’a for a total of $95,000. He then drove off 32,347 head of cattle belonging to Dowsett, Meek, and James Robinson and constructed a fence around the outer boundary of his property (Bordner and Silva 1983:C-12). In 1879, Campbell brought in a well-driller from California to search the ‘Ewa Plain for water and successfully “tapped artesian water which, from internal pressure, forced its way to the surface without being pumped” (Hitch 1992:79). Following this discovery, plantation developers and ranchers drilled numerous wells in search of the valuable resource. By 1881, the Campbell property of Honouliuli prospered as a cattle ranch with “abundant pasturage of various kinds” (Briggs in Haun and Kelly 1984:45). Within ten years of the first drilled well in ‘Ewa, the addition of a series of artesian wells throughout the island supplied most of Honolulu’s water needs (Armstrong and Bier 1983).

In 1889, Campbell leased his property to Benjamin Dillingham, who subsequently formed the Oahu Railway & Land Company (OR&L) in 1890. To attract business to his new railroad system, Dillingham subleased all land below 200 ft elevation to William Castle who in turn sublet the area to the Ewa Plantation Company for sugarcane cultivation (Frierson 1972:15). Dillingham’s Honouliuli lands above 200 ft elevation that were suitable for sugarcane cultivation were sublet to the Oahu Sugar Company.

Ewa Plantation Company was incorporated in 1890 and operated into modern times. The plantation grew quickly with the abundant artesian water. As a means to generate soil deposition on the coral plain and increase arable land in the lowlands, the Ewa Plantation Company installed
ditches running from the lower slopes of the mountain range to the lowlands, then plowed the slopes vertically just before the rainy season to induce erosion (Frierson 1972:17).

The Oahu Sugar Company was incorporated in 1897 and included lands in the foothills above the ‘Ewa Plain and Pearl Harbor. Prior to commercial sugar cultivation, the lands occupied by the Oahu Sugar Company were described as being “of near desert proportion until water was supplied from drilled artesian wells and the Waiahole Water project” (Condé and Best 1973:313). The Oahu Sugar Company took control of the Ewa Plantation lands in 1970 and continued operations into the 1990s.

Dillingham’s mauka (inland, toward the mountains) lands in western Honouliuli that were unsuitable for commercial sugar production remained pasture for grazing livestock. From 1890 to 1892, the Ranch Department of the OR&L Company desperately sought water for their herds of cattle, tapping plantation flumes and searching for alternative sources of water. Ida von Holt shared the following account of her husband Harry’s (Superintendent of the OR&L Ranch Department) search for water in the foothills of the Wai’anae Range:

One of those places is on the old trail to Pālehua, and had evidently been a place of which the Hawaiians had known, for its name is Kalo’i (the taro patch), and even in dry weather water would be standing in the holes made by the cattle, as they tried to get a drop or two. [von Holt 1985:136]

It is believed that the spring depicted in this account may have been identified during an inventory survey for the adjacent Pālehua East B project (Tulchin and Hammatt 2005). The spring was located along the upper slopes of the southern face of Kalo’i Gulch. A second account is given of the discovery of spring water in an area over the ridge on the north side of Kalo’i Gulch:

Shouting to the men to come over with their picks and shovels, he [Harry von Holt] soon got them busy clearing away lots of small stones and earth. Almost at once they could see that there were evidences of a paved well, and at about three feet down they came upon a huge flat rock, as large around as two men could span with their arms. Digging the rock loose and lifting it to one side, what was their astonishment to find a clear bubbling spring! [von Holt 1985:138]

Following the discovery, two old Hawaiians began to ask Von Holt about the spring:

Finally he [Harry von Holt] got them to explain that the spring, called ‘Waihuna’ (Hidden Spring) had been one of the principal sources of water for all that country, which was quite heavily populated before the smallpox epidemic of 1840 […] A powerful Kahuna living at the spring had hidden it before he died of the smallpox, and had put a curse on the one who disturbed the stone, that he or she would surely die before a year was out. [von Holt 1985:138–140]

3.1.5 1900s

In 1913, the Waiahole Water Company, a subsidiary of the Oahu Sugar Company, began a project to transport irrigation water from the well-watered windward side of O‘ahu, through the Ko‘olau Range, to the fields and mill of the Oahu Sugar Company in ‘Ewa. The water system, named the Waiahole Ditch System, was declared “an engineering feat of epic proportion for those times” (Condé and Best 1973:37). The original system, when completed, collected water from
stream intakes and water tunnels from Kahana Valley in the north to Waiʻahole Valley in the south. The main tunnel extended through Waiʻahole Valley to Waiawa, and water was then transported by ditch westward to Honouliuli, covering approximately 22 miles (Condé and Best 1973:37). The ditch system was completed in 1916 and, with some modifications, much of the ditch is in use today. This active portion of the ditch extends from the windward side of the island into Honouliuli. Remnant, inactive portions of the system extend southwest onto the ‘Ewa Plain. The remnant portion of the Waiahole Ditch crosses through the southwestern portion of the present project area.

Much of the mauka lands in western Honouliuli, including ridges and deep gulches, were unsuitable for commercial sugar cultivation and remained pasture land for grazing livestock. The Donn 1906 map suggests the present project area was at the edge of sugarcane cultivation at that time (Figure 11). By 1920, however, much of the lands of Honouliuli were used for commercial sugarcane cultivation (Frierson 1972:18).

A 1919 map (Figure 12) shows ditches, reservoirs, roads, and railroad lines downslope of the project area. This map shows an unimproved road alignment just south of the project area, understood as the Pālehua Road, approximating a traditional Hawaiian footpath into the uplands. However, a 1922 map (Figure 13 and Figure 14 showing annotations), shows the called out Pālehua trail as jogging into the southwest portion of the project area. This 1922 map shows pineapple fields in at least 13 locations among the foothills of the southeast Wai`anae Range. The nearest of these pineapple fields wrapped around Pu‘u Kapua‘i some 500 m to the northwest. At least six (typically quite small) plantation camps were scattered along the bottom of these foothills with the nearest being about 500 m to the north of the project area. The Kupihau Ranch Station is shown about 2.6 km to the north. The water troughs and tanks shown upslope of the ranch station attest to the cattle operations in the vicinity at that time.

By 1925, most of the project area is depicted as within Oahu Sugar Company plantation Field 30 (Figure 15). The extreme upslope end of the project area still appears to be outside the area of sugarcane cultivation, in keeping with the depiction on the 1906 Donn map (compare with Figure 11).

In the late 1920s, the main residential communities were at the northeast edge of the ‘Ewa Plain and the largest community was still located at Honouliuli Village. ‘Ewa was primarily a plantation town, focused around the sugar mill, with a public school as well as a Japanese school. Additional settlement, in Waipahu, centered around the Waipahu sugar mill operated by the Oahu Sugar Company. However, small plantation camps were scattered within the extensive sugarcane fields (as indicated in Figure 14).

By 1936, however, “Pump Camp 5” had been established on either side of a pipeline that bisected the present project area, as seen on a 1936 U.S. Army War Department map (Figure 16). The 1936 map indicates approximately seven houses on the northeast side of the pipeline and 17 houses on the southwest side of the pipeline within the present project area at that time. The central pipeline extended downslope from the Waiahole Ditch to a large pump house structure that still exits just southeast (outside) of the project area. The alignment of the Waiahole Ditch crossing the western portion of the project area, and a roughly parallel road just upslope, are clearly depicted. It appears a spur plantation railroad serviced Pump Camp 5 connecting to the northeast and continuing a short distance to the southeast.
Figure 11. Portion of the 1906 Donn Hawaii Territory Survey map of Oahu with land use (RM 2374) showing breakdown of land use in southwest O‘ahu
Figure 12. Portion of 1919 U.S. Army War Department fire control map, Nanakuli quadrangle showing the project area
Figure 13. Portion of 1922 Wall map of Honouliuli Forest Reserve (HTS Plat 2065) showing the location of the project area
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Figure 14. 1922 Wall map of Honouliuli Forest Reserve (HTS Plat 2065) showing the location of the project area with annotations.
Figure 15. 1925 Oahu Sugar Company plantation map showing project area (red) as largely within former Field 30 (Condé and Best 1973:317)
Figure 16. Portion of the 1936 U.S. Army War Department terrain map, Waianae quadrangle showing the location of the project area
A 1943 U.S. Army War Department map (Figure 17) shows much the same scene, though the unimproved road crossing the western portion of the project area now wraps around Pu‘u Kapua‘i. Additional new, unimproved roads suggest the expansion of sugarcane fields. The extensive system of fences depicted upslope indicates cattle ranching was still a significant enterprise.

Historic maps of the Makakilo area indicate a lack of any other significant development in the area into the 1940s. Major land use changes came to western Honouliuli when the U.S. Military began development in the area. Military installations were constructed near the coast as well as in the foothills and upland areas. Barbers Point Military Reservation (a.k.a. Battery Barbers Point from 1937–1944), located at Barbers Point Beach, was used beginning in 1921 as a training area for firing 155 mm guns (Payette 2003). Also in the vicinity were Camp Malakole Military Reservation (a.k.a. Honouliuli Military Reservation), used from 1939, and Gilbert Military Reservation, used from 1922–1944. Barbers Point Naval Air Station (NAS), in operation from 1942 into the 1990s, was the largest and most significant base built in the area. It housed numerous naval and defense organizations, including maritime surveillance and anti-submarine warfare aircraft squadrons, a U.S. Coast Guard Air Station, and components of the U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Fort Barrette (a.k.a. Kapolei Military Reservation and Battery Hatch), located atop Pu‘u ‘o Kapolei to the southwest, was used from 1931 to 1948 for housing four 3-inch anti-aircraft batteries (Payette 2003). In the 1950s, the site was used as a Nike missile base. Palailai Military Reservation, located atop Pu‘u Pāla‘ila‘i in Makakilo to the west, was in service from 1921, housing Battery Palailai and Fire Control Station B (Payette 2003). Fire Control Station A was located atop Pu‘u Makakilo approximately 1.4 km to the southwest of the project area. From 1942 to 1945 the Pu‘u Makakilo Training Area, including lands in and around Pu‘u Makakilo, was used for military training during World War II (Environment Hawai‘i 1992).

The 1951 aerial photograph (Figure 18) clearly shows the two neighboring housing areas of Pump Camp 5 within the central portion of the project area (just northwest and southwest of the pump house building or pumping station which remains just outside the project area). While the majority of the project area was under sugarcane cultivation, it appears the southwest portion, west or upslope of the Waiahole Ditch, was not under cultivation at that time, used instead as grazing lands. The west portion of the project area appears to have been previously cultivated but appears fallow. Extensive areas north of Pu‘u Kapua‘i appear to be under pineapple cultivation.

The 1953 USGS map (Figure 19) shows much the same landscape as the 1943 map (see Figure 17) except the railroads have now all disappeared—quickly replaced by trucking after World War II. A naval reservation is shown on the southeast base of Pu‘u Makakilo. An access road developed to service the present quarry is now depicted running up the mouth of Kalo‘i Gulch, parallel to and just north of the Kalo‘i Stream channel. The initial date of construction of an industrial quarry within Kalo‘i Gulch—depicted to the south (outside) of the current project area—is uncertain, though historic maps indicate a construction window between 1943 and 1952. In 2004, CSH conducted an archaeological inventory survey whereby the quarry was documented and designated an historic property, SIHP # 50-80-12-6680.

The 1968/1969 USGS map (Figure 20) no longer shows Pump Camp 5, which had been prominent at least as early as 1936 (see Figure 16) and lasted until at least 1953 (see Figure 19). The “Pumping Station” immediately southeast of the project area is still labeled and in general the plantation infrastructure (other than the train lines) appears active. The road up Kalo‘i Gulch,
Figure 17. Portion of the 1943 U.S. Army War Department terrain map, Waipahu quadrangle showing the project area
Figure 18. 1951 USGS aerial photograph (UH MAGIS) showing the project area
Figure 19. Portion of the 1953 Ewa and Schofield Barracks USGS topographic quadrangles showing the project area
Figure 20. Portion of the 1968 Ewa and 1969 Schofield Barracks USGS topographic quadrangles showing the project area
depicted as improved in 1953, is now shown as unimproved, suggesting abandonment of some quarrying operations.

### 3.1.6 Contemporary Land Use

Modern maps of the Makakilo area indicate vast changes to the project area and surrounding lands, including the retreat of the sugarcane fields, the construction of the H-1 Freeway, and the partial construction of the Pu‘u Makakilo Golf Course and Grace Pacific Makakilo Quarry.

A 1968 USGS aerial photograph (Figure 21) shows virtually the entire project area still utilized for sugarcane, though there is no trace of the former Pump Camp 5 residential areas that appear to be entirely covered with cane. Many of these plantation homes are understood to have been slightly raised on “tofu-block” foundations that allowed for relatively complete demolition, leaving only the remnants of privies and trash pits. The 1968 photograph also shows new fields to the northwest (see Figure 21).

In 1969 and 1970, Pacific Concrete and Rock Company, Ltd. began subsurface drilling on the southward facing slopes of Pu‘u Makakilo for a new quarry location. The company’s previous quarry in Pu‘u Pāla‘ila‘i that had been in operation for the past 22 years was nearly exhausted. The newly proposed Makakilo Quarry would “encompass 72 acres of actual total quarry area and 188 acres of green belt buffer. Of the 72 acres of actual quarry area, only a maximum of 18 acres will be under active quarrying at any given time” (Cerny 1972:1).

A 1977 USGS aerial photograph (Figure 22) appears to display decreased sugarcane cultivation in the Wai‘anae foothills. It is not clear if the project area is in active cultivation or not. Clearly by 1993 (Figure 23) sugarcane cultivation within the project area is finished, although it remains active immediately southeast of the project area.

Sometime in the early 1990s, a group of Japanese investors poured $70 million into the development of the Pu‘u Makakilo Golf Course. The golf course’s exact date of construction is unclear; however, the proposed area was surveyed by Sinoto in 1988 (Sinoto 1988). The golf course was situated on the slopes of Pu‘u Makakilo just north of the rock quarry. During a burst bubble in the Japanese investment market the project foundered, and the course and buildings were purchased by Grace Pacific in 1994 (Honolulu Advertiser, May 2004:31). Construction of the golf course resulted in grading and terracing of a large area southwest of the present project area for fairway construction.
Figure 21. 1968 USGS aerial photograph (UH MAGIS) showing the project area
Figure 22. 1977 USGS Orthophotoquad aerial photograph, Ewa and Schofield Barracks quadrangles showing the project area.
Figure 23. 1993 NOAA aerial photograph (UH MAGIS) showing the project area
3.2 Previous Archaeological Research

Previous archaeological studies in the vicinity (within approximately 1.5 km) of the current project area are shown in Figure 24 and Table 1, and a summary of these studies follows. Figure 25 and Table 2 show the locations of historic properties in the vicinity of the project area. There are no sites documented by McAllister (1933) in his early archaeological reconnaissance study of O‘ahu in the vicinity of the project area.

3.2.1 Bordner 1977

In 1977, the Archaeological Research Center Hawaii, Inc. (Bordner 1977) conducted an archaeological reconnaissance survey of a then proposed Kalo‘i Gulch landfill location, approximately 500 m west of the present project area. The study concluded the lower section of the gulch had been extensively modified through quarrying operations and cattle ranching. Foundations of both crushing and loading facilities were noted. In the upper reaches of the property, three walls of possible pre-Contact origin were documented between 1,250 and 1,300 ft elevation and designated as SIHP #s 50-80-12-2600, -2601 and -2602. These three historic properties were in the extreme, upslope end of the large property more than 1.5 km from the present project area. SIHP # 50-80-12-2600 was a low (only 0.61 m, or 2 ft high) wall of poorly stacked pāhoehoe, approximately 7.62 m (25 ft) long set on top of a small knoll jutting out from the slope. SIHP # 50-80-12-2601 is described as a wall built on the stream terrace cut following the course of the stream and constructed of stacked pāhoehoe with a total length of 67.70 m (222.1 ft), an average height of 0.91 m (3.0 ft) and incorporating in situ boulders into the wall. The wall appeared to have been constructed so as to protect a stream terrace from erosion. It also retained a terrace measuring approximately 12 m (39.4 ft) by 31 m (101.7 ft). SIHP # 50-80-12-2602 was a free-standing 18.2 m (59.7 ft) wall of stacked pāhoehoe that had the appearance of being a boundary wall. The historic properties were regarded as of “a marginal status” and no further archaeological work was recommended for the area covered by the reconnaissance survey.

3.2.2 Sinoto 1988

In 1988, the Bishop Museum Applied Research Group conducted a surface survey for a then proposed Makakilo Golf Course just southwest of the current project area (Sinoto 1988). The study concluded the majority of the project area had been damaged by severe erosion. No surface historic properties were documented and subsurface testing was deemed unnecessary. Just west (outside) of the golf course property, one deteriorated wall segment was documented on the northeast slope of Pu‘u Makakilo. The wall, designated SIHP # 50-80-12-1975, may have served as an “historic erosional control feature” (Sinoto 1988:1). Due to the deteriorated condition of the wall remnant, no further work was recommended.

3.2.3 Spear 1996

Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. conducted an archaeological reconnaissance survey of a large area extending from south of the H-1 freeway to the north side of Renton Road (Spear 1996). No historic properties were identified.

3.2.4 Dega et al. 1998

In 1998, Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. (SCS) conducted an archaeological inventory survey for the University of Hawai‘i, West O‘ahu Campus project area (Dega et al. 1998). The
Figure 24. Portion of the 1998 Ewa and Schofield Barracks USGS topographic quadrangles showing the locations of previous archaeological studies in the vicinity (within approximately 1.5 km) of the project area.
Table 1. Previous archaeological studies within the vicinity (within approximately 1.5 km) of the project area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Type of Study</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bordner 1977</td>
<td>Archaeological reconnaissance survey</td>
<td>Proposed Kalo‘i Gulch landfill location</td>
<td>Three walls designated as SIHP #s 50-80-12-2600, -2601 and -2602 in extreme west, upslope end of property, more than 1.5 km from present project area (hence not depicted in Figure 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinoto 1988</td>
<td>Archaeological reconnaissance survey</td>
<td>Makakilo Golf Course</td>
<td>Documented a low stacked boulder wall outside the property: SIHP # 50-80-09-1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dega et al. 1998</td>
<td>Archaeological inventory survey</td>
<td>UH West O‘ahu, TMK: [1] 9-2-002:001</td>
<td>Documented two historic property complexes: historic irrigation and plantation infrastructure system (SIHP # 50-80-08-5593) and Waiahole Ditch System (SIHP # 50-80-09-2268)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnuson 1999</td>
<td>Archaeological reconnaissance survey</td>
<td>‘Ewa Plain</td>
<td>Identified six concrete bridges, a railroad track, and a set of unidentified concrete features; no SIHP #s assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulchin et al. 2001</td>
<td>Archaeological inventory survey</td>
<td>Proposed ‘Ewa Shaft Renovation project, Honouliuli Gulch, adjacent to west-bound lanes of H-1, TMK: [1] 9-2-001</td>
<td>Identified one historic property: SIHP # 50-80-08-6370, stone wall alignment; also documented large pumping station and shaft building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulchin and Hammatt 2004</td>
<td>Archaeological inventory survey</td>
<td>86-acre proposed Pālehua Community Association, TMKs: [1] 9-2-003:078 por. and 079</td>
<td>Four historic properties identified: a complex of concrete and iron structures associated with industrial rock quarry operations (SIHP # 50-80-12-6680); three boulder mounds believed related to land clearing or ditch construction by Oahu Sugar Co. (SIHP # 50-80-12-6681); a small terrace believed to function as historic water diversion feature (SIHP # 50-80-12-6682); and a remnant portion of Waiahole Ditch (SIHP # 50-80-09-2268)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Type of Study</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulchin and Hammatt 2005</td>
<td>Archaeological inventory survey</td>
<td>71-acre proposed Pālehua East B project, Makakilo, TMKs: [1] 9-2-003:076 and 078</td>
<td>Three historic properties identified: pre-Contact agricultural alignment and mound (SIHP # 50-80-12-6666), plantation-era stacked basalt boulder walls and a ditch (SIHP # 50-80-12-6667), and single alignment of upright basalt boulders and small, low terrace (SIHP # 50-80-12-6668)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Hare et al. 2006</td>
<td>Archaeological inventory survey</td>
<td>Ho’opili East Kapolei</td>
<td>Documented six previously identified historic properties: plantation infrastructure (SIHP # 50-80-12-4344); railroad berm (SIHP # 50-80-12-4345); northern pumping station (SIHP # 50-80-12-4346); central pumping station (SIHP # 50-80-12-4347); southern pumping station (SIHP # 50-80-12-4348); and documented four newly identified features of SIHP # 50-80-12-4344: a linear wall, stone-faced berm, concrete ditch, and concrete catchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmussen and Tomonari-Tuggle 2006</td>
<td>Archaeological monitoring</td>
<td>Waiau Fuel Pipeline corridor</td>
<td>No historic properties identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulchin and Hammatt 2007</td>
<td>Archaeological literature review and field inspection</td>
<td>Approx. 790-acre parcel, TMK: [1] 9-2-003:002 por. and 005 por.</td>
<td>Documented features interpreted as related to pre-Contact indigenous Hawaiian habitation (SIHP #s 50-80-08-2316 and 50-80-12-2602); historic ranching and related features (SIHP # 50-80-12-2601); and historic quarrying and related features (SIHP # 50-80-12-6680) and various pre- and post-Contact features (designated with temporary #s CSH1–CSH22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooney and Cleghorn 2008</td>
<td>Archaeological reconnaissance survey</td>
<td>TMK: [1] 9-2-003:018</td>
<td>No historic properties identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groza et al. 2009</td>
<td>Archaeological inventory survey</td>
<td>TMKs: [1] 9-2-001:001 por., 004, 005, 006, 007 por.; 9-2-002:002</td>
<td>No historic properties identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Type of Study</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunkin and Hammatt 2009</td>
<td>Archaeological inventory survey</td>
<td>TMKs: [1] 9-2-002:006; 9-2-003:079</td>
<td>Documented two newly identified historic properties: irrigation ditches (SIHP #s 50-80-12-6950 and -6951); and one previously identified historic property, Waiahole Ditch (SIHP # 50-80-09-2268)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyon et al. 2010</td>
<td>Archaeological monitoring</td>
<td>TMKs: [1] 9-2-002:006; 9-2-003:079</td>
<td>No historic properties identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyon et al. 2011</td>
<td>Archaeological monitoring</td>
<td>TMKs: [1] 9-1-018:001, 003, 004, 005; 9-2-002:001, 006</td>
<td>Documented two historic properties: a water diversion and a trash deposit (SIHP #s 50-80-12-4664 and -7128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacheco and Rieth 2014</td>
<td>Archaeological inventory survey</td>
<td>East Kapolei Solar Farm, TMK: [1] 9-2-002:006 por.</td>
<td>Documented SIHP # 50-80-12-7433, an unpaved early twentieth century agricultural (ranching and/or sugarcane cultivation) road, understood as created between 1918 and 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapor et al. 2018</td>
<td>Archaeological inventory survey</td>
<td>Makakilo Dr extension project, TMKs: [1] 9-2-002:007, 009, 009; 9-2-003:074, 092; 9-2-039:110, 114; and 9-2-045:001</td>
<td>Documented two historic properties: SIHP # 50-80-09-2268, remnant portion of Waiahole Ditch, and SIHP # 50-80-12-6951, irrigation ditches; identified one new feature of Waiahole Ditch, an earthen mound and stacked stone wall, interpreted as likely remnants of a reservoir (Feature D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 25. Portion of the 1998 Ewa and Schofield Barracks USGS topographic quadrangles showing the locations of previously identified historic properties in the immediate vicinity of the project area (note the SIHP # -5593 property boundary is defined as the Dega et al. 1998 project area and not the true extent or location of its features)
Table 2. Previously identified historic properties in the vicinity of the project area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIHP #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-1975</td>
<td>Low-stacked boulder wall segment</td>
<td>Sinoto 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-09-2268</td>
<td>Waiahole Ditch System</td>
<td>Goodman and Nees 1991; Hammatt et al. 1996; Dega et al. 1998; Tulchin and Hammatt 2005; Hunkin and Hammatt 2009; Zapor et al. 2018; Shideler and Hammatt 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-4664</td>
<td>Historic water diversion structure</td>
<td>Nakamura et al. 1993; Runyon et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-08-5593</td>
<td>Plantation-era “flumes, aqueducts, ditches, pumps, and other irrigation features”</td>
<td>Dega et al. 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-08-6370</td>
<td>Stone wall alignment, likely associated with cattle ranching or pumping station</td>
<td>Tulchin et al. 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-6666</td>
<td>Alignment and mound</td>
<td>Tulchin and Hammatt 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-6667</td>
<td>Two walls</td>
<td>Tulchin and Hammatt 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-6668</td>
<td>Alignment and terrace</td>
<td>Tulchin and Hammatt 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-6680</td>
<td>Complex of concrete and iron structures associated with industrial rock quarry operations</td>
<td>Tulchin and Hammatt 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-6681</td>
<td>Three boulder mounds believed related to land clearing or ditch construction by Oahu Sugar Company</td>
<td>Tulchin and Hammatt 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-6682</td>
<td>Terrace believed to function as an historic water diversion feature</td>
<td>Tulchin and Hammatt 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-6950</td>
<td>Portion of a plantation-era irrigation ditch</td>
<td>Hunkin and Hammatt 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-6951</td>
<td>Portion of a plantation-era irrigation ditch</td>
<td>Hunkin and Hammatt 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-7128</td>
<td>Burned trash fill layer</td>
<td>Runyon et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIHP #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-7433</td>
<td>Unpaved early twentieth century agricultural (ranching and/or sugarcane cultivation) road, understood as created between 1918 and 1928</td>
<td>Pacheco and Rieth 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-7484</td>
<td>Post-Contact irrigation ditch portion</td>
<td>Pacheco and Rieth 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-12-7485</td>
<td>Post-Contact irrigation ditch portion</td>
<td>Pacheco and Rieth 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80-08-9068</td>
<td>Honouliuli National Monument (Internment Camp)</td>
<td>National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Bridges</td>
<td>No SIHP #s assigned, no further documentation or mitigation recommended</td>
<td>Magnuson 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Bunker</td>
<td>WWII-era bunker</td>
<td>Mooney and Cleghorn 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSH 1</td>
<td>Post-Contact wall related to historic ranching</td>
<td>Tulchin and Hammatt 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSH 2 (Mounds)</td>
<td>Two basalt mounds interpreted as possible trail markers</td>
<td>Tulchin and Hammatt 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.2.4 Dega et al.: 1998

The survey encompassed the entirety of the current project area. Several plantation-era “flumes, aqueducts, ditches, pumps, and other irrigation features occurring within the heavily modified landscape” were noted (Dega et al. 1998:i). The features represented an extensive complex of sugarcane irrigation features used from the 1920s through more recent times. The irrigation complex was designated SIHP # 50-80-08-5593. A portion of the Waiahole Ditch System (SIHP # 50-80-09-2268) (previously recorded by Goodman and Nees 1991) was also documented crossing through the northwest section of the subject parcel and continuing southwest through the lower agricultural fields. No artifacts were recovered from the project area. No further work was recommended for SIHP # 50-80-08-5593.

An overlay of the present project area on the Dega et al. (1998) plan map (Figure 26) indicates it lies entirely within the south/central portion of the 1998 AIS project. While the Dega et al. (1998) plan map should probably be understood as a sketch, it does indicate certain remnants of plantation infrastructure (designated as SIHP # 50-80-08-5593) were present in the property in 1998. Dega et al. (1998) defined the entire project area as the boundaries of SIHP # 50-80-08-5593. However, the identified features represent a substantially smaller area than the overall boundary.

3.2.5 Magnuson 1999

In 1999, an archaeological reconnaissance survey was completed by International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc. (IARI) for a Farrington Highway Expansion project extending along 5.3 km (3.3 miles) of Farrington Highway between Golf Course Road and Fort Weaver Road with a roughly 61-m (200-ft) wide corridor on each side (Magnuson 1999). The project identified six concrete bridges, one railroad track, and “a set of unidentified concrete features” (Magnuson 1999:17). The study concluded the following:

The sites observed in the Farrington Highway Expansion project are neither exemplary sites of their kind nor unique. Therefore these sites have been adequately recorded during the investigations and no further work is necessary should preservation not be possible. [Magnuson 1999:25]

3.2.6 Tulchin et al. 2001

CSH archaeologists completed an archaeological inventory survey in support of a proposed ‘Ewa Shaft Renovation project. The ‘Ewa Shaft project is within Honouliuli Gulch, adjacent to the west-bound lanes of the H-1 Interstate Highway, approximately 1.7 km east of the present project area. That property included a pumping station enclosure and the surrounding area of approximately 1 acre. The survey documented one historic property, a stone wall alignment designated SIHP # 50-80-08-6370. Subsurface testing was conducted adjacent to the wall. The study interpreted the wall alignment as associated with cattle ranching or the pumping station. The study also documented a portion of the large pumping station and shaft building on the property.

3.2.7 Tulchin and Hammatt 2004

In 2004, CSH conducted an archaeological inventory survey to the west of the current project area for the Pālehu Community Association (PCA) in Makakilo (Tulchin and Hammatt 2004). Three overhang shelters were observed and tested, however, no cultural material was identified during excavation. The study documented several historic properties, including a complex of
Figure 26. Plan map of the AIS for the University of Hawai‘i, West O‘ahu Campus project area showing historic properties (as of 1998) with an overlay of the current project area (adapted from Dega et al. 1998:3). This overlay suggests “Pump Station 12 and Mill” and a ditch were documented as within the present project area and another ditch and road and “Stone stack” were adjacent to the north side of the present project area (note this is a sketch and locations are approximate).
concrete and iron structures associated with industrial rock quarry operations (SIHP # 50-80-12-6680); three boulder mounds believed to be related to land clearing or ditch construction by the Oahu Sugar Company (SIHP # 50-80-12-6681); a small terrace believed to function as an historic water diversion feature (SIHP # 50-80-12-6682); and a remnant portion of the Waiahole Ditch (SIHP # 50-80-09-2268).

### 3.2.8 Tulchin and Hammatt 2005

In 2005, CSH conducted an archaeological inventory survey west of the current project area for the proposed Pālehua East B project in Makakilo (Tulchin and Hammatt 2005). The study identified three historic properties, including an alignment and a mound (SIHP #s 50-80-12-6666A and B), two walls (SIHP #s 50-80-12-6667A and B), and an alignment and terrace (SIHP #s 50-80-12-6668A and B). SIHP # 50-80-12-6667 is thought to contain remnants of plantation infrastructure. The historic properties were documented in an unnamed gully south of Kalo’i Gulch.

### 3.2.9 O’Hare et al. 2006

In 2006, CSH conducted an archaeological inventory survey of approximately 1,600 acres for the East Kapolei project (subsequently known as the Ho’opili project) to the southeast of the present project area (O’Hare et al. 2006). The Ho’opili project was bounded on the east by Fort Weaver Road, makai (seaward) by Mango Tree Road, and mauka by the H-1 Freeway.

Several historic properties documented by the O’Hare et al. (2006) study were previously identified during an archaeological survey in 1990 (Hammatt and Shideler 1990). These previously identified historic properties included SIHP # 50-80-12-4344, plantation infrastructure; SIHP # 50-80-12-4345, railroad berm; SIHP # 50-80-12-4346, northern pumping station; SIHP # 50-80-12-4347, central pumping station; and SIHP # 50-80-12-4348, southern pumping station.

The survey identified four additional features of SIHP # 50-80-14-4344. These additional features include Feature D, a linear wall along the east bank of Honouliuli Stream; Feature E, a linear wall along the west bank of Honouliuli Stream; Feature F, a stone-faced berm constructed perpendicular to the orientation of the stream; and Feature G, a concrete ditch and concrete masonry catchment basement on the west bank of Honouliuli Gulch. None of the historic properties identified in the O’Hare et al. study (2006) were near the present project area.

### 3.2.10 Rasmussen and Tomonari-Tuggle 2006

In 2006, IARII conducted archaeological monitoring along the Waiau Fuel Pipeline corridor, extending from the Hawaiian Electric Company’s Barbers Point Tank Farm to the Waiau Generating Station (Rasmussen and Tomonari-Tuggle 2006). The Waiau Fuel Pipeline corridor follows Farrington Highway to Kunia Road, angles makai near Kunia Road, then continues east along the OR&L right-of-way near the Pearl Harbor coast. It appears no archaeological monitoring was conducted west of Waipi’o Peninsula, as the corridor to the west was determined to not be archaeologically sensitive. No historic properties were identified during archaeological monitoring.

### 3.2.11 Tulchin and Hammatt 2007

In 2007, CSH completed an archaeological literature review and field inspection of an approximately 790-acre parcel at Pālehua, Makakilo (Tulchin and Hammatt 2007). The inspection
covered portions of Maka‘iwa Gulch, Awanui Gulch, and Kalo‘i Gulch. Overall, 26 historic properties were identified during the field inspection. The study included further documentation of four previously identified historic properties: SIHP # 50-80-08-2316, a ku‘ula stone; SIHP # 50-80-12-2601, a pre-Contact wall utilized as a water control feature; SIHP # 50-80-12-2602, a pre-Contact wall possibly utilized for agriculture; and SIHP # 50-80-12-6680, a complex of concrete and iron structures associated with industrial rock quarry operations.

Newly identified historic features (designated with temporary CSH site #s) included CSH 1, wall; CSH 2, mounds; CSH 3, large enclosure; CSH 4, platform; CSH 5, mounds; CSH 6, adze; CSH 7, platform; CSH 8, terraces; CSH 9, enclosure and two small caves; CSH 10, enclosure; CSH 11, mound; CSH 12, platform; CSH 13, enclosure; CSH 14 terrace; CSH 15, wall remnant, hearth, and military “foxhole”; CSH 16, terrace and hau thicket; CSH 17, level soil along ridge; CSH 18, enclosure; CSH 19, trail; CSH 20 water tunnel; CSH 21, large boulder with petroglyphs; and CSH 22, enclosure with stone uprights. These potential historic properties were not assigned SIHP #s.

Other than the previously reported SIHP # -6680 complex of structures associated with industrial rock quarry operations, none of the identified historic properties were in the vicinity of the present project area.

3.2.12 Mooney and Cleghorn 2008

In 2008, Pacific Legacy, Inc. conducted an AIS (recorded as an archaeological assessment due to lack of finds) for the proposed Makakilo Quarry expansion (Mooney and Cleghorn 2008). No historic properties were identified; however, the remnants of a modern, abandoned golf course were noted.

3.2.13 Groza et al. 2009

In 2009, CSH conducted an AIS (recorded as an archaeological assessment) for the Ho‘opili project 440-Ft Elevation Reservoir and Water Line project (Groza et al. 2009). No historic properties were identified.

3.2.14 Hunkin and Hammatt 2009

In 2009, CSH completed an archaeological inventory survey for an approximately 62-acre Makakilo Drive extension project (Hunkin and Hammatt 2009). The project documented two newly identified historic properties (SIHP #s 50-80-12-6950 and -6951). Both historic properties are portions of plantation irrigation ditches. The ditches functioned to transport water for irrigation of the sugarcane fields.

In addition to the newly identified historic properties, the project documented a portion of the previously identified SIHP # 50-80-09-2268 alignment. A meeting was held on site within the project area with CSH staff, SHPD staff, and Mr. Shad Kane on 10 February 2009 to discuss the alignment. Mr. Kane led the group along the graded alignment of SIHP # 50-80-09-2268, within the property, indicating the ditch had been constructed over the alignment of an ancient Hawaiian trail. SHPD staff observed the plantation irrigation ditch and associated infrastructure and concurred the alignment was a portion of the Waiahole Ditch System. SHPD staff also concluded the ditch was most likely constructed over the alignment of a pre-Contact Hawaiian trail. SHPD staff expressed a concern that documentation make it clear the pre-Contact Hawaiian trail function...
was the dominant function of this designated site in the vicinity (which was then developed as the Waiahole Ditch in the early twentieth century). This discussion of a Hawaiian trail function was understood to apply only to that portion of the Waiahole Ditch System at Kalo‘i Gulch.

Two new features (SIHP # 50-80-09-2268 Features B and C) associated with the main ditch were also documented. These features are drainage-related, with the function of preventing storm water and sediment from entering the main Waiahole Ditch.

3.2.15 Runyon et al. 2010

In 2010, CSH conducted archaeological monitoring for Phase 1B of the North-South Road project (Runyon et al. 2010). No historic properties were identified.

3.2.16 Runyon et al. 2011

In 2011, CSH completed archaeological monitoring for phase 1C of the North-South Road project (Runyon et al. 2011). Two historic properties were identified. A previously identified historic water diversion structure (SIHP # 50-80-12-4664), originally documented by Nakamura et al. (1993), was observed on the southwest edge of Ramp C. A newly identified burnt trash fill layer (SIHP # 50-80-12-7128) was documented directly under Pālehua Road on the west edge of Ramp A.

3.2.17 Pacheco and Rieth 2014

In 2014, IARII conducted an archaeological inventory survey (Pacheco and Rieth 2014) for an East Kapolei Solar Farm project (on approximately 19 acres of TMK: [1] 9-2-002:006). The study documented one historic property: SIHP # 50-80-12-7433, an unpaved early twentieth century road related to ranching and/or sugarcane cultivation in the area, understood as created between 1918 and 1928.

3.2.18 Zapor et al. 2018

CSH conducted a supplemental archaeological inventory survey for the Makakilo Drive Extension project (Zapor et al. 2018). The survey identified two historic properties: remnant portions of the Waiahole Ditch (SIHP # 50-80-09-2268) and irrigation ditches (SIHP # 50-80-12-6951). The project documented an additional feature of the Waiahole Ditch, an earthen mound and stacked stone wall, interpreted as likely remnants of a reservoir (Feature D). SIHP # 50-80-12-6951 was observed as an irrigation ditch and associated retaining wall, pipe, valve, and sluice gate remnants.

3.3 Background Summary and Predictive Model

Background research of Honouliuli Ahupua‘a indicated pre-Contact settlement was centered around the rich cultivated lands of Honouliuli ‘Ili for extensive wetland taro cultivation and abundant coastal resources. The extensive limestone plain also included recurrent use habitations for fishermen and gatherers, and sometimes gardeners. The upland dry forest areas were used for hunting and gathering of forest resources, but likely not for widespread permanent settlement. In the intermediate area between the limestone plain and the upland forests, in the vicinity of the current study area, indigenous Hawaiian activities would have been limited to dryland agriculture within gulches or near springs, and mauka to makai trails and associated temporary shelters.
Within the “Maka‘īwa Hills” area, which is southwest of the project area, pre-Contact habitation sites were found clustered in higher elevations above 1,000 ft, and in lower elevations below 500 ft (Hammatt et al. 1991). The higher elevations, where the current study is located, do not contain forest subsistence resources.

In Von Holt’s (1985) accounts of discovering spring water southwest of the study area, it is noted that Kalo‘i had “been a place of which the Hawaiians had known” and the area “had been quite heavily populated before the smallpox epidemic of 1840” (von Holt 1985:138–140). However, there was no mention of observations of any physical evidence of Hawaiian settlement, other than the paved well (Hidden Spring). It is quite possible ranching or agricultural activities destroyed any remnants of Hawaiian occupation prior to the late 1800s.

By 1920, the lands of Honouliuli were used primarily for commercial sugarcane cultivation and ranching (Frierson 1972). Much of the mauka lands in western Honouliuli, including ridges and deep gulches, were unsuitable for commercial sugar cultivation and remained pasture land for grazing livestock. Historic maps indicate a lack of any significant development within the study area into the 1940s. Modest constructions in the area included Pālehua Road, allowing access to the uplands of western Honouliuli, as well as plantation infrastructure within and to the south of the study area.

Previous archaeological research in the vicinity of the project area has identified pre-Contact sites including habitation structures (temporary and permanent) and agricultural features (terrace and mounds). Of particular interest are three pre-Contact historic properties located within the mauka reaches of Kalo‘i Gulch. All three were determined to be related to erosion control and water management and suggest that in the past water was available, at least on a seasonal basis, in the Kalo‘i Gulch area. Historic properties identified in the vicinity of the study area include plantation-era infrastructure (ditches, flumes, clearing mounds, etc.) related to the Ewa Plantation Company and Oahu Sugar Company.

Based on background research, archaeologists expected to document historic features related to sugarcane cultivation and ranching, including walls, fences, maintained springs, and water tunnels as well as irrigation infrastructure including ditches and flumes related to the Ewa Plantation Company, Oahu Sugar Company, and the Waiahole Ditch System.
Section 4  Results of Fieldwork

The project area consists of a largely undeveloped property with rolling hills and several gulch areas. In general, the sloping lands within the project area are dry, fallow lands that appear to have undergone significant erosion of topsoil. Much of the nearly 101.62-acre project area is covered in thick vegetation including California grass (Brachiaria mutica), koa haole (Leucaena leucocephala), williwili (Erythrina sandwicensis), sweet acacia or klu (Acacia farnesiana), and kiawe (Prosopis pallida) (Figure 27 through Figure 29). The hillside within the project area also exhibited land modification in the form of graded access roads, bulldozed clearings, a portion of the Waiahole Ditch System, and remnants of the abandoned historic irrigation system and plantation infrastructure. Modern barbed wire fences were also observed surrounding the southern border of the project area, indicative of the continued use of portions of the project area for grazing livestock. Cow paths were identified meandering throughout the project area. Various fence posts were observed in the southwest project area, determined not to be associated with those fence lines noted on historic maps of the area based on their location and alignment (Figure 30).

The 1936 U.S. Army War map (see Figure 16) shows a camp (“Pump Camp 5”) located in the central portion of the project area. The camp is last depicted on the 1953 USGS map (see Figure 19). On the 1968 USGS map (see Figure 20) the camp is no longer depicted. An effort was made to identify any remnants of the former camp during fieldwork, but no remnants were identified during the pedestrian inspection.

The pedestrian survey identified two historic properties within the project area: SIHP # 50-80-08-5593, identified as remnant structures associated with water allocation related to plantation activities, and SIHP # 50-80-09-2268, identified as a portion of the Waiahole Ditch System, which extends along the northern boundary of the project area, crossing into the southwest project area and exiting at the southern boundary. Both of these historic properties were previously identified in the immediate area by Dega et al. (1998). The current project documented two features of SIHP # 50-80-08-5593 (Features 1 through 2E), which include retention basins, drain pipes, culvert, sluice gates, and various other components related to water control and retention. Most features of SIHP # 50-80-08-5593 were identified extending northwest to southeast down a slope in the north portion of the project area, designated as a complex related to water control. The complex is related to— and in line with — the pump station and mill building at the base of the hill, just outside the southern boundary of the project area. The complex consists of various water retention components, runoff features, a remnant water tower, pipes, and concrete features likely housing additional pipes. The uppermost components in this complex of features were constructed around a portion of the Waiahole Ditch, and would have utilized water from the ditch, channeling it down the slope to the pump station and mill, where it would have been pumped out to irrigate the surrounding sugarcane fields. One additional feature was identified in the north/central project area.

A remnant portion of the Waiahole Ditch (SIHP # 50-80-09-2268) extends along the northern boundary of the project area. Toward the western portion of the project area, the Waiahole Ditch crosses through the project area and extends to the southwest. The ditch extends underground through much of the project area. Observed portions of the ditch displayed culverts, bridges, tunnels, and flumes. Composition of the ditch varied from entirely earthen portions to concrete