

Semi-Annual Report

on the

Section 106 Programmatic Agreement

among

the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration

the Hawai'i State Historic Preservation Officer

the United States Navy

and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

regarding the

Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project

in the City and County of Honolulu, Hawai'i

Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project

July 2011

Introduction

The Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project (HHCTCP) is an elevated, electrically powered, fixed guideway transit system in the east-west travel corridor between East Kapolei and the Ala Moana Center via the Honolulu International Airport with an approximate length of twenty miles and with twenty-one stations. The Project is seeking financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration and is, therefore, subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470f), and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR 800. Under Section 106, a Programmatic Agreement (PA) was signed on January 18, 2011, by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the U.S. Navy (U.S. Naval Base Pearl Harbor), and the Hawai'i State Historic Preservation Officer. The City and County of Honolulu (City) and the National Park Service were invited signatory parties.

In addition, the following parties were included in the consultation process and offered an opportunity to concur:

- Historic Hawai'i Foundation
- National Trust for Historic Preservation
- University of Hawai'i Historic Preservation Certificate Program
- AIA Honolulu
- Hawai'i Community Development Authority
- Office of Hawaiian Affairs
- O'ahu Island Burial Council (OIBC)
- Royal Order of Kamehameha
- The Ahahui Ka'ahumanu
- Hui Mālama I Nā Kūpuna O Hawai'i Nei
- Hale O Nā Ali'i O Hawai'i
- Māmakakaua: Daughters and Sons of the Hawaiian Warriors
- Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs
- Ali'i Pauahi Hawaiian Civic Club
- Ka Lei Maile Ali'i Hawaiian Civic Club
- King Kamehameha Hawaiian Civic Club
- Nānāikapono Hawaiian Civic Club
- Hawaiian Civic Club of Wahiawa
- Ahahui Siwila Hawai'i O Kapolei Hawaiian Civic Club
- Waikīkī Hawaiian Civic Club
- Princess Ka'iulani Hawaiian Civic Club
- Wai'anae Hawaiian Civic Club
- Merchant Street Hawaiian Civic Club

- Prince Kūhiō Hawaiian Civic Club
- Pearl Harbor Hawaiian Civic Club
- Hawaiian Civic Club of 'Ewa-Pu'uloa
- Kalihi-Palama Hawaiian Civic Club
- Hawaiian Civic Club of Honolulu

On July 1, 2011, the public transit authority known as the “Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation” (HART) was established pursuant to Article XVII of the Revised Charter of the City and County of Honolulu 1973, as amended. HART assumed all lawful obligations owed by or to the City related to the HHCTCP as of July 1, 2011, including the City’s obligations under the PA, and is responsible for the development, operation, maintenance and expansion of the HHCTCP.

Stipulation XIV.E.3 of the PA requires HART to provide a summary progress report outlining work undertaken pursuant to the PA’s terms every six months.

The following is a status update on PA implementation for the period January 18, 2011, through July 18, 2011. The report is organized according to each PA stipulation. The following appendices are included:

- Appendix A—Meeting Notes
- Appendix B—Stipulation V, Recordation and Documentation
- Appendix C—Major Milestones

Activity Summary by Stipulation

I. Roles and Responsibilities

For all work carried out under the PA's terms requiring compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, Stephanie Foell, Senior Supervising Architectural and Landscape Historian, of Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB), HART's General Engineering Consultant (GEC), represents and coordinates HART's interests and responsibilities.

A team of architectural historians, who also meet the Secretary's Qualification Standards, are also participating in this work. All architectural historians executing and supervising work on the Honolulu Rapid Transit Project's Programmatic Agreement (PA) meet or exceed the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. Matt McDaniel, Lead Architectural Historian, also brings Professional Qualifications Standards in both Architectural History and History. Denise McGeen, Architectural Historian meets the Professional Qualifications Standards in Architectural History. Collectively, this team is responsible for all documentation stipulated in the PA requiring professional cultural resources training and experience. In addition, they bring the direct experience developing and successfully completing all products required in the PA.

HART funded and initiated the procurement process to fill the PA Project Manager (Kako'o) position in May 2011. After review by FTA and the SHPD, the City issued a Request for Proposals Part 1 (RFP) for the position on May 19, 2011 and offers were received on June 20, 2011. RFP Part 2 was issued on July 27, 2011.

Next Steps

HART will coordinate with FTA and SHPD to complete the procurement process, and the Kako'o will begin work as outlined in the PA. This position is expected to start work in October 2011.

II. Traditional Cultural Properties

As part of the PA, the FTA and HART agreed to undertake a study to determine the presence of previously unidentified traditional cultural properties (TCP) within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) as defined in the PA. The SRI Foundation has been retained to assist HART and the FTA with this stipulation. In addition, SRI has retained Kumo Pono Associates, a local historical and ethnographic research firm familiar with Hawaiian culture and language. The City held an initial outreach meeting on February 12, 2011 and initiated additional research on June 22, 2011.

Next Steps

In the next six months, an interim report will be submitted to the Consulting Parties regarding research related to the identification of previously unidentified TCPs in the first two corridor sections from East Kapolei to Aloha Stadium.

III. Identification and Protection of Archaeological Sites and Burials

Phase 1—The archaeological inventory survey plan (AISP), survey (AIS) report, and data recovery plan have been submitted to the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD). The

AISP and AIS report have been approved by SHPD. A Draft Data Recovery Plan for lo'i sediments found at the Waipahu Transit Center station site is still under review by SHPD.

Phase 2—The AISP was approved by SHPD, and the AIS and report are nearly complete. Completion of the survey and report are pending access to two private properties.

Phase 3—A draft AISP will be submitted to SHPD for review in August.

Phase 4—A kickoff meeting was held on March 16, 2011, with OIBC, lineal and cultural descendents, Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHO), and other interested parties. Additional follow up has occurred since the meeting to assist in developing the Draft AISP. These meetings are documented in the Draft AISP submitted to SHPD for review on May 18, 2011.

In addition to the ground surveys, a draft burial consultation protocol for *iwi kupuna* that may be discovered during the survey in the City Center section has been prepared. It was submitted to SHPD, the OIBC, and a list of cultural and lineal descendents for review and comment on July 19, 2011.

Next Steps

Phase 1—Complete data recovery at Waipahu Transit Center station site.

Phase 2—Complete AIS and develop an archaeological data monitoring plan for SHPD review in August 2011.

Phase 3—Begin AIS in October 2011.

Phase 4—Begin AIS in September 2011.

Complete burial consultation protocol plan by September 2011.

IV. Design Standards

The City developed the Project's *Design Language Pattern Book* and posted it on the project website. In addition, on February 28, 2011, the Project provided the consulting parties with the preliminary design plans completed for the Project. Three consulting parties provided comments on preliminary station designs. Draft responses to those comments are under development and will be posted to the Project website site for review. Individual letters to the commenter's will also be mailed.

In addition, the City held two initial meetings, on March 30, 2011 and June 15, 2011, to discuss the preliminary designs for the six western most stations. Comments from these meetings are also posted on the Project website and will be considered as station designs evolve.

A revised meeting schedule is included in Appendix C, Programmatic Agreement Major Milestones.

Next Steps

The project team will respond to initial comments and will conduct additional meetings as the final design process continues. Future station designs will incorporate surrounding buildings and area elements, including historic context if applicable. In addition, the design may incorporate interpretive elements and art displays.

HART will consider all comments received from the consulting parties and the public and will balance local design influences, historic context, community input, and native Hawaiian interests.

V. Recordation and Documentation

Two meetings were held to begin identification of possible historic context studies and cultural landscape reports on March 2 and April 7, 2011. An outline for a historic context study (HCS) has been drafted and is being refined. The HCS outline focuses on the linear impact of the project as it passes through each moku and ahupua'a (Hawaiian land designations denoting the relationship between the mountain and the sea) along the project corridor. Staff historians have initiated preliminary research for the HCS and drafted sample text so that the consulting parties could comment on level of detail, tone, etc. HART sent this text, which describes the Nu'uauu 'auwai system, to the consulting parties on July 12, 2011.

In addition, a list of potential sites for cultural landscape reports (CLR) was provided by the consulting parties at these meetings. Project staff reviewed and vetted this list and two sites have emerged as strong candidates—Mother Waldron Park and Irwin Park. HART circulated a memo regarding the selection process for these sites on July 12, 2011.

Finally, the City sent a letter to the National Park Service (NPS) on May 25, 2011, to request identification of adversely affected eligible or listed historic properties to receive HABS/HAER/HALS (HHH) documentation. The City received a response from the NPS on June 29, 2011.

Appendix B provides

- Sample historic context section
- CLR recommendation memo
- HABS/HAER/HALS NPS response

Next Steps

HART will continue to research and draft additional HCS text for review by the consulting parties. Comments from the consulting parties on the sample HCS text will be considered for ongoing development of the report, and HART will identify and form a review panel to inform the process and maintain high accuracy and quality standards. HART expects that this HCS work will continue over the next two to three years; ongoing work will include conducting intensive-level research, writing, and photography/illustration collection.

HART will finalize and confirm selection of CLR sites.

HART will continue to coordinate with the NPS on the HHH documentation.

HART will hire a professional photographer to complete required photography for all adversely affected historic properties in areas where construction will occur in the next six months.

HART will also engage a professional videographer to document the Project corridor prior to construction commencement.

VI. National Register of Historic Places/National Historic Landmark Nominations

The City sent a letter to the Navy on May 25, 2011, requesting approval to update the Pearl Harbor National Historic Landmark (NHL) and CINCPAC Headquarters Building NHL

nominations. The Navy responded on June 16, 2011 indicating that access to Navy property will be granted for purposes of documentation.

HART is currently negotiating a contract to complete a National Register nomination for the Hono'uli'uli Stream Bridge.

PB systems analysts, programmers, and project visualization staff continue to develop and populate a web-based map that includes a searchable, interactive database of historic properties within the APE.

Next Steps

HART will continue to coordinate with the Navy for approval to update the Pearl Harbor and CINCPAQ Headquarters Building NHL nominations.

Development of the interactive historic properties database will continue.

VII. Educational and Interpretive Programs, Materials, and Signage

HART hosted a kickoff meeting with consulting parties on July 7, 2011, to begin developing the interpretive plan. HART presented general interpretive concepts and principles, examples of other transit- and transportation-related interpretive programs, and other examples of innovative interpretation for the consulting parties' consideration.

Next Steps

HART will continue to collect all information gathered under this PA that will inform components of the interpretive plan, humanities program, and education programs. HART will also coordinate with its architects during final design regarding station components related to signage, displays, or other interpretive features.

VIII. Mitigation for Specific Historic Properties

As discussed above, HART is proposing Mother Waldron Park and Irwin Park as possible candidates for CLRs. If selected for CLR documentation, the recommendations/treatment plans set forth in these CLRs could be incorporated into the park improvement plan and executed using park improvement funds. , This stipulation also addresses specific historic properties that will be adversely affected during construction. Construction has not begun near those historic properties.

Next steps:

HART will finalize the selection of CLR sites.

IX. Measures to Address Reasonably Foreseeable Indirect and Cumulative Effects Caused by the Project

The Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) has been created according to the requirements of this stipulation. The HPC held its kickoff meeting on July 8, 2011, to begin work related to the allocation of the \$2 million fund for exterior improvements. Members of the HPC include

- Toru Hamayasu, Chair—Interim Executive Director, HART
- Bruce Nagao—HART

- Angie Westfall—Architectural Branch Chief, SHPD
- David Tanoue—Director, City of Honolulu Department of Planning and Permitting
- Kiersten Faulkner—Executive Director, Historic Hawaii Foundation
- Mahealani Cypher—Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs
- Dana Yee—American Society of Landscape Architects

Under this stipulation, HART is required to monitor the proposed demolition of resources built before 1969 within the APE and within a 2,000-foot radius of each station.

HART established a baseline for demolitions by calculating an annual average and standard deviation of demolitions that occurred within the study area between 2005 and 2008. A list of annual demolitions was supplied by the City's Department of Planning and Permitting. The results are as follows:

- 2005—27 demolitions
- 2006—17 demolitions
- 2007—29 demolitions
- 2008—23 demolitions

The average number of demolitions between 2005 and 2008 within the study area is 24 and the standard deviation is 4.58. The stipulation requires HART to notify the consulting parties during each scheduled quarterly and annual review of the PA when the number of demolitions of listed or eligible resources or resources built prior to 1969 within the study area is greater than one standard deviation above the baseline. Therefore, the number of demolitions required to notify consulting parties is calculated to be 29.

Next Steps

The HPC will continue to meet regarding the administration of funds allocated under this stipulation.

HART will annually monitor the number of demolitions within the study area and notify the consulting parties during each scheduled quarterly and annual review should the number of demolitions exceed 29 properties.

X. Construction Protection Plan

A Construction Mitigation Plan (CMP), which will include a Noise and Vibration Mitigation Plan, is currently being developed according to the requirements of this stipulation.

Next Steps

HART will complete a CMP and provide the plan to contractors before construction begins. HART will provide an update on this plan to the attendee's at the October 2011 PA quarterly meeting.

XI. HART Contractors and Contract Adherence to PA

HART is developing a historic and cultural awareness training program for contractors and employees.

Next Steps

HART will complete development of the historic and cultural awareness training program, and contractor training will begin prior to construction this fall. HART will circulate all training materials to the consulting parties.

XII. Post-Review Discoveries

To date, no unanticipated discoveries have been made along the Project corridor.

XIII. Public Information

This semi-annual progress report will be posted on the Project website.

Next Steps

The historic properties database is currently being developed.

XIV. Administrative Provisions

The implementation schedule, circulated on March 16, 2011, has been posted on the project website and is included in Appendix C.

Next Steps

HART will hold a third quarterly meeting with the consulting parties in October 2011 to discuss ongoing implementation of the PA. The next semi-annual report will be prepared in January 2012.

Appendix A

Meeting Notes



Traditional Cultural Properties Review

Date and Time: **February 12, 2011, 10:00 am**

Location: **Kapolei Hale, Kapolei, HI**

Summary

An opening pule by Kahu Kaleo Patterson began the meeting. Faith Miyamoto from RTD welcomed all in attendance. After an overview of the agenda, project staff gave a short overview of the project. This was followed by a presentation by Martha Graham, of the SRI foundation, who gave an overview of how traditional cultural properties are identified and researched.

After a short break the meeting continued facilitated by Ms. Graham to gain feedback from attendee's on places and additional issues that should be researched. The meeting focused on two questions identified below. The following are comments that were heard. In addition, two people requested individual follow-up. This information will be used in developing the scope of work for continued study of potential previously unidentified traditional cultural properties.

Questions #1: Are there places along or near the project area that are associated with cultural practices or beliefs that are rooted in your community's history, and are important in maintaining the cultural identity of your community?

- Introductions followed by sharing of mana'o:
 - 'Ewa/Pu'uuloa Hawaiian Civic Club (HCC)
 - Ko'olaupoko HCC
 - 'Ewa Pu'uuloa HCC (Limu Project)
 - Pearl Harbor HCC (Aha Ki'ole)
 - Correct map by adding streams
 - Source of water are important for limu, fish, etc.
 - Waimano 'ili—stream is important
 - Waipahu—Many changes due to Pearl Harbor and sugar plantations
 - Look for knowledgeable kūpuna especially in areas where land and water meet
 - Important that rail not block access (mauka/makai) and separate the lifestyle
 - Do not cut off areas that are used for makahiki purposes
 - McKeague—knowledgeable about Wai'anae and Kalaeloa. Kumu Hula area resources. His Kumu is Vickie Holt Takamine.
 - Honouliuli—entire landscape is important; be careful of the visual impact/blight impact. Cultural practices are important = continuity of expression.
 - Story of Hi'iaka I ka poli o Pele is important
 - There are many stories about the cycle of life
 - Kamapua'a is associated with Pu'u Kapolei
 - Stores about the transition of seasons are from this area
 - Technology/process does not address needs in various phases.
 - Honolulu came after Lahaina, area was a bread basket guarded by Ka'ahupāhau

- These are not folks with tales, these are us (our stories)
 - Pearl Harbor changed the area however there is a greater history before then. Sugar Mill 1894—Waipahu includes 1) Waipi'o 2) Waikele 3) Hoaeae
 - Waipahu—Lokoi'a was tremendous. Many ethnicities.
 - Delta area contains artesian wells
 - Pohakea—used to have lehua on 'ewa plains
 - Rail creates the opportunity to share stories about our places.
 - Concerned about the impact on watersheds, villages, rivers, and streams are polluted, dried up; runoff impact on mullet, fish
 - This TCP discussion is late, waste of time
 - TCP study should have been done earlier, should have been factored into the route selection. Purpose of study is to protect TCPs.
 - TCP is central to our identity, traditions and includes Hawai'i loa.
 - Need to identify TCPs in each phase; the definition of TCP is narrow.
 - Should not separate processes of TCP and 'iwi
 - Concerned about the project effect on the opio and next generation
- There were many concerns related to the identification and treatment of 'iwi kūpuna and the following highlights the concerns and issues:
- Important to locate burial areas because this is where our people lived.
 - Traditions of caring for the 'iwi, practice of caring is also very important.
 - Concerned about 'iwi on Queen Street.
 - Concerned about the process (AIS)
 - No AIS study or TCP study done so incomplete process and approach is piecemeal
 - Concerns for 'iwi kūpuna, we are also associated w/living community/identity in order to maintain our Native Hawaiian (NH) people
 - Honouliuli; there was a flaw in the process regarding the identification of na 'iwi kūpuna
 - Concerned about Phase IV AIS process.
 - Phased archaeology, AIS and TCP studies after the route selection not pono

Questions #2: Who are the best people in your community to talk to and learn about these places and their importance?

- Douglas Chong—author of Chinese book which is a good resource
- Goro Arakawa—Waipahu
- Arlene Eatin—Pu'uloa
- Suggest attending NHO meetings, HCC, OHA, OIBC meetings
- Interview fishermen, Hālau wa'a, Hālau hula
- Honor your time with kūpuna
- Speak with 'opio (youth) for their mana'o
- ka'opua volunteered to help us put our groups together

➤ Additional Mana‘o:

- There are many people that could not attend today but are very interested
- Suggest allowing time for all sides to share at the next mtg. so decisions can be more informed
- A statement of the history of the Hawaiian people was shared showing the connection to the past.
- Nā ‘iwi kūpuna are a part of the conversations affecting the entire project
- Corridor should not block access
- mo‘olelo on the mountain tops affects the project
- we need to go into the communities and everyone should be a part of the conversation
- need to follow up on TCPs that were shared today
- team should share time tables for study
- voices should be one to share information and knowledge

Attendees

Melia Lane Kawahale, NPS
Clifford Hoo, Historic Press
Larry Woode, ‘Ewa-Pu‘uloa HCC
Jordan Buresh, PJRC
Henry Curtis, Ka Lei Maile Alii
Charles Kapua, Sha Kiole O‘ahu
Hinaleimoana Falemei, OIBC
Henry Chang, LB
Kaola Lindsey, OHA



Meeting Summary

Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) Study Meeting June 2011

Date and Time: **June 23, 2011**
Location: **Ali'i Place, Honolulu, HI**

Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of the approach for conducting additional TCP research related to previously unidentified TCP's as identified in the programmatic agreement. The meeting provided an opportunity for the consulting parties to meet with the SRI Foundation and Kumu Pono Associates to ask questions and provide feedback to the research team on possible interviews and additional research.

Discussion

Faith Miyamoto opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to the second Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) Study meeting for the Project. After giving everyone the opportunity to introduce themselves, Miyamoto summarized the current status of the TCP study. Since the Programmatic Agreement was signed, the City has continued its cultural resources research for the Project. On February 12, 2011, the City held its first TCP meeting. Based on that meeting, the City concluded that there is more to learn about whether there might be previously unidentified TCPs in the Project vicinity. The City made the decision to continue its TCP research and outreach. The Project team has been mindful of the issue of TCPs even when pursuing other aspects of cultural resources, and the City's intention is to inform the TCP study with the cultural landscapes report, historic context study, archaeological work, and other research, as possible.

Barbara Gilliland reflected that much has been accomplished since the first TCP meeting in February. She emphasized that the City and PB have been listening to the consulting parties, and responded to what they have heard. She noted that many aspects of the Project are interrelated; that TCPs relate to burials, cultural landscapes, and historic context. She indicated that the studies will be coordinated and also that some of the information will be used for interpretation at stations, etc.

Gilliland introduced Kepā Maly and Onaona Pomeroy Maly, of Kumu Pono Associates, LLC (KPA), as the Hawaiian team conducting the TCP study. KPA has a deep understanding of Native Hawaiian culture and language, and its inclusion in the Project was in response to the consulting parties' comments and requests. Gilliland said that the Project also will continue its relationship with SRI Foundation (SRIF), to use its expertise on TCPs and federal regulations. Whether the subsequent research identifies TCPs as defined by federal regulations, the TCP study will add important information to the Project, which can be used in many different ways.

David Cushman reviewed that SRIF was called in to assist PB and the City because of its expertise with TCPs. SRIF will assist them in following the Programmatic Agreement and implementing the TCP study as required under Section 106. KPA will gather information about places in the Project area, and submit that information to SRIF. SRIF will make recommendations to the City regarding whether or not there are TCPs in or near the APE that are National Register-eligible that may be affected by the Project. SRIF's role is to see the right people are consulted, and the regulations followed so that the City, and the Federal Transit Administration can make management decisions. He noted that since he and Martha Graham of SRIF are not Hawaiians, KPA will do the actual TCP research for the Project.

Maly began with a Hawaiian saying – not all knowledge comes from one school. He said that KPA are not experts, but they will try to do the best job they can on the project. He explained that KPA will bring historical documentary materials, including materials from Native Hawaiian language newspapers, to the Project, as well as contemporary interviews. He appealed to the consulting parties to make recommendations on the number of interviews that should be conducted, and with whom.

KPA has reviewed the Project's cultural resources work to date, which is good work. KPA will not redo that work, but will fill in some blanks they have identified. Their goal is to add spirit and flesh that will make the piles of stones and bones come alive. KPA hope to develop a responsible sampling of voices that have first-hand knowledge of the lives that they describe. Maly noted that the Project corridor is full of storied places. The land starts out as sacred, and even if there is no physical evidence, the stories and place names may reflect this sacredness. Even if places do not rise to the level of "TCP," it will be worthwhile to record information about them. Although no one can be completely successful, Maly said that KPA will do its best to develop a spirited discussion of the area within the Project.

Pua Aiu asked if KPA would organize the TCP study by ahupua'a or some other geographic reference. The study will do both; some TCPs might cross ahupua'a boundaries, while others might be within them.

Keola Lindsey referenced a letter that the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) sent to the City in early March about the TCP study. He expressed OHA's excitement that the City had brought in KPA to conduct the TCP study. He said that it was good to hear that the results of the study, even if places did not meet the level of "TCP," would be incorporated into the Project. He reiterated that OHA was pleased with KPA's participation and looked forward to the study. Maly said that he had not seen the letter, and Gilliland said that she would give him a copy.

Aiu noted that there are "layers" of TCPs, and asked about other communities – for example, the Navy, Japanese, and Filipino. Cushman explained that this work was specific to Native Hawaiian TCPs. Aiu reiterated that other cultures and communities have a relationship to lands within the Project corridor. She indicated that her understanding was that the PA did not limit the TCP study to Native Hawaiians. Graham asked if Aiu could point to examples, in Hawaii or elsewhere, of TCPs that were not Native Hawaiian or Native American that could be used as models. Aiu said that this project was the "guinea pig," so she did not have any examples, although she understood that Trestles Surf Break in California was being considered for its importance to the surfing community. Gilliland pointed out that a lot of research has preceded the TCP study, including work that addresses other descendent communities in the Project area. Lindsey said that he appreciated Aiu's perspective; while OHA advocates for Native Hawaiians, he wants to make sure others' stories are heard. Lindsey's primary interest, however, is in a Native Hawaiian TCP study. Cushman noted that often non-Native Hawaiian or non-Native American places may be eligible for listing in the Nation Register for values other than having traditional religious and cultural significance. Maly commented on the opportunity for someone to develop a synthesis of all the studies being done.

Cushman said that we did not want to give the consulting parties false expectations. He explained that while federal agencies are not required to preserve and protect historic properties, they *are* required to consult with the people who care about those places. The work that SRIF and KPA do will help to ensure that Native Hawaiians are listened to, and that their concerns are heard and considered in the planning process.

Gilliland expressed her excitement that the Project is at the point where it can begin to incorporate information that it has been compiling into interpretive work.

Maly asked Gilliland for digital files that he can manipulate. He again requested the names of people that KPA should interview for the study. Kepā and Onaona Maly are close to Auntie Arleen Eaton, whose name was suggested in the February 12, 2011, TCP meeting. He noted that there were many who had knowledge but who have already passed on. Maly said that our kupuna are our most fragile resource – KPA wants to interview them first, and so needs recommendations.

Gilliland said that she would work with Kim Evans to get KPA the list of names they have compiled for consulting parties. Maly confirmed that he will not only be talking with agencies and representatives of Native Hawaiian organizations, but also with individuals. Kaleo Patterson also agreed to provide names that have resulted from his outreach activities. He suggested that KPA attend the upcoming Native Hawaiian convention. Maly agreed that it would be useful, and added that he could not wait until August, when the convention is scheduled, to begin interviews. Lindsey told Maly that he could provide names and background for individuals that KPA could include, and Maly should call him after the meeting.

Maly said that he did not think there were any TCP “show stoppers” in Segments 1 or 2 of the Project area; however, the big issues are related to burials. He acknowledged that we cannot know everything, and until construction starts, we will not know whether burials will be disturbed. He asked whether burials were TCPs. Gilliland noted that, in addition to having information at hand before construction starts, the Project now has the right team to come back to when it needs more information. Cushman acknowledged the importance of burials and the emotions that are involved in thinking and talking about them. In response to the question that Maly posed, the Native Hawaiian community needs to be asked its views, and noted the role of the Oahu Island Burial Council (OIBC) under state law. Cushman referenced the call for burial procedures in the Programmatic Agreement, and Gilliland said that they were in the process of developing this Burial Protocol.

Ellyn Goldkind asked when the consulting parties could expect to receive TCP study materials that they would need to review. Gilliland said that the initial report, for the first half of the corridor, would go to the consulting parties sometime in October/November 2011. The second half would be in the late spring 2012. Goldkind also asked for names and contact information for the team, and Gilliland requested that communication go through Gilliland or Miyamoto.

Maly returned to the issue of consultation and interviews. He said that KPA would be available to meet at times other than during the work-day, and is willing to schedule meetings during the early morning or in the evenings. Paterson offered to help Maly in setting up additional meetings with Native Hawaiian consulting parties. Paterson expressed commitment to ensuring that the Native Hawaiian consulting parties are included at the beginning; that they are involved in the process, and not just asked to support a final report at the end of the project.

Gilliland agreed that this meeting did not preclude having additional meetings with the consulting parties.

Regarding burials, Maly noted that throughout his 30 years of research, without exception, most Hawaiians prefer as a first choice to leave iwi burials in place. He referenced the traditional dictum that, once buried, “we don’t expose our bones to the sun.” Maly recognized that sometimes it is necessary to move the remains. He reflected that, given the history of the countryside, it would be more unusual *not* to find iwi than to find them. During interviews, one of the questions that Maly will ask will be, if iwi are found, what should happen? He has found that it is a good practice to have this discussion as part of the interviews. Cushman noted that having such a discussion is the respectful thing to do. Cushman agreed that preservation in place should always be the preferred option. When it is not possible, then something else will need to be done. Gary Omori expressed his appreciation to Maly for bringing up the topic, and

giving him an explanation for why the reburials that Omori has participated in always took place before sunrise. Evans expressed her appreciation for what Maly said, and his support for the idea of preserving burials in place. She said that, spiritually, these are not easy issues to deal with, and was grateful that KPA would be involved.

Maly noted that, among the things that were calls to war for Hawaiians, cremation and the comingling or mixing of iwi are two. He suggested that the Burial Protocol address this. Paterson added that theirs is a living culture; for various reasons, contemporary practices can be different. Some families practice cremation, for example. There are cases where families have chosen to leave burials in place but others where the families were troubled at the thought of traffic driving over their relatives, and so had the burials moved. Maly agreed that there are many issues requiring talk story to consider them. Paterson said that the City is committed to the talk story format.

As part of its research, KPA will be reviewing the entire Mahele to identify family names so that the City will know which families would need to be contacted if burials are found at any given part of the Project corridor. Presenting the Mahele information that KPA has gathered is an example of how the TCP study can provide an added benefit to the community that goes beyond its narrow research focus.

Maly spoke of the opportunities to include information from the TCP study in the design of the rail line and stations. He suggested not only design elements evocative of the specific stories and landscapes through which the rail will cross, but also the possibility of including interview materials at various points along the way or in the stations. Ryan Tam said that the City has a professional audio and video recording team that should be able to help KPA with appropriate interviews.

Gilliland concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for their participation. She reminded everyone that this is not the beginning of the project, or its end, and that we would be continuing to work together.

Implementation / Next Steps

KPA will provide SRIF with its findings on Segments 1 and 2 and an interim draft report will be prepared on the first two segments. KPA and SRIF will present the information to the consulting parties on Segments 1 and 2 in the fall. KPA and SRIF will complete Segments 3 and 4, and will present a draft report about that area in Spring 2012 to the consulting parties. A final report will be produced in summer 2012. Cushman indicated that the cultural experts will be coordinating with each other, noting that the Project will benefit from the collective interaction and integration of their reports.

Attending Signatories and Consulting Parties

Pua Aiu (SHPD)
Kiersten Faulkner (Historic Hawaii Foundation) (call in)
Carrie Kreshak (NPS) (call in)
Keola Lindsey (OHA) (call in)
Roxanna Hernandez (FTA, Region 9) (call in)
Honor Keeler (National Trust for Historic Preservation) (call in)
Ellyn Goldkind(Navy) (call in)

Attending (project/city staff)

City of Honolulu

Faith Miyamoto
Kaleo Patterson
Ryan Tam
Bruce Nagaro

PB

Barbara Gilliland
Kim Evans
Gary Omori (Public Involvement)

SRIF

David Cushman
Martha Graham

KPA

Kepā Maly
Onaona Pomeroy Maly



Meeting notes for

Farrington Station Group Community Presentation Review Section 106 Programmatic Agreement Consulting Parties Meeting

Date and Time: **March 30, 2011, 10:00 am**

Location: **RTD Office, Alii Place, 23rd Floor Conference Room**

Presentation

An overview of the project was provided, including a summary of current status and schedule. The Farrington station group designs previously shown to the public in 2009 (includes West Loch, Waipahu Transit Center, and Leeward Community College Stations) were shown, along with a summary of the 300+ comments received from the community during the workshops.

Regarding the Community Meetings

- It was noted that comments from the 2009 community meetings are online on the Honolulu Transit website (www.honolulustransit.org). Comments that came out of this meeting will be sent to all attendees and consulting parties.
- Another meeting is planned in approximately 3 months for consulting parties and the public to be updated on the station designs—targeted for June 2011.
- In February, RTD sent out a DVD with the PE-level designs for the guideway, stations, maintenance and storage facility, and other supporting facilities for comments by the consulting parties.

Discussion

- Concern was expressed about pōhaku (rock) stone-work in relation to the station design. It was agreed that we have to be sensitive to that issue and we need to talk with the community.
- It was noted there is a termite infestation on wood in Hawai'i that could affect beams that support the platform canopies at stations. It was agreed that when we get to construction, we will need to take a look at this issue. There was also some concern with the roof life; there may be issues and leaks. It was stated that the roof has an estimated 50-year life.
- It was mentioned that the *Compendium of Design Criteria* and the *Design Language Pattern Book* are (or will soon be) available on the website in the Section 106 tab.
- It was noted that a problem with the drawings and images presented is that they are acontextual; people have more difficulty understanding what is next to the station in regard to the urban fabric of the community; more detailed maps are needed and we need some type of photographs that will enable us to understand the surrounding environment; for example, LCC—we don't know what the college buildings look like.
- Concern was expressed about the project's impact on the existing center median on Farrington Highway on which the State has done a beautification program. How can we control graffiti and what is the plan for that strip once the concrete guideway is constructed above? What about plantings and landscaping? We need to identify the plans and on-going maintenance for that area.
- There is concern about the viaduct at the airport where the columns had graffiti and the planters, which were placed in the 1970s and were attractive, but have since become neglected and are an eyesore and a barrier between the two parts of the city.
 - It was noted that the project has a master landscape architect that will be responsible for the landscaping for the entire system so that the plant materials can be sustained in

different environments. There should be a consistency with visual themes and materials that are appropriately located. The median will be landscaped with irrigation in the median, and the maintenance will be taken care of by maintenance staff. Appropriate materials are being planned in the proper areas and the columns will have graffiti protection.

- On Kahekili Highway, they planted something that grows and crawls up the walls; that would also be an excellent anti-graffiti tool. The only down side is that it takes time for it to grow up the wall.
- It was noted the sails of the station platform are not related to the station design itself. Response was that this is a common theme that runs throughout every station.
- It was suggested there is a need for establishing a context independent of the platform itself; a pedestrian level comfort with an architectural familiarity in terms of scale, textures, and finishes. It was recommended that the station exterior reflect a consistent theme that respects the Hawaiian culture and climate in a contemporary way, while the station interior could have a local theme that reflects the neighborhood/community. It was suggested that visitors would also enjoy and appreciate these themes.
- It was asked if there are any station designs that have been proposed as a consistent standard and “look” to every station. The response was that there are similar elements from station to station; however, the context of each would be different. There will be a balance of all of the concepts as we go into all of the communities that have a particular point of view that they have brought to the table. Perhaps we could realize that there would be a single commonality that commuters and visitors would feel as they are in the Hawaiian Islands “externally” and get a feel for the local community “internally.”
- It was mentioned that although the design pattern book is filled with much information on indigenous Hawaiian forms, that the design doesn’t seem to reflect the themes identified. It is such an important source of information that needs to be relied upon; the designers should be more responsive to the content and designs in the pattern book. Without reference to the book, some of the important features may be eliminated in the process. One member suggested designs should incorporate the Ānuenuē (rainbow) theme and name, as that is one of the symbols of Hawai‘i. It is important to utilize a sophisticated level of Hawaiian language and culture in the Rail Transit project so that the project becomes a hallmark of the Hawaiian culture.
- It was asked if a more unified design could be considered for all of the stations. It was suggested that a unified design would help tie the system together to enhance the identity of the system. The response was that the City would consider that suggestion.
- It was mentioned that OIBC still has concerns with phases 3 and 4 concerning ‘iwi kupuna.
- It was suggested that throughout the modern history of Hawai‘i, city and state government has demonstrated a lack of empowerment with regards to the Hawaiian language and sense of place; there needs to be some incorporation of this into the design of the stations.
- It was asked, “what do visitors expect when they visit Hawaii?” We need to focus on comfort levels and standards.
- It was noted that West Loch is a name that we utilize for the (planning stage of the) Project, but all provisions of names, places, historical figures, and events in Hawaiian culture should be integrated into the plan. We should elevate the Hawaiian language so that is incorporated into the surroundings. We must realize that everyone who has made Hawai‘i home has contributed to the slow demise of the Hawaiian culture (whether they realize it or not). This is an important facet to maintain.

Attending Project Staff

Mark Garrity, PB/GEC
Ken Caswell, RTD
Ryan Tam, RTD
Mike Yoshida, RTD
Kanuji Parmar, PB/GEC
Bruce Nagao, RTD
Barbara Gilliland, PB/GEC
Faith Miyamoto, RTD
Matt Derby, PB/GEC
Kaleo Patterson, RTD

Attending Consulting Parties (in person)

John Desoto (on behalf of Mahealani Cypher), Hawaiian Civic Clubs
Hinaleiamoana Falemei, OIBC
Mahealani Cypher, Oahu Council, Hawaiian Civic Clubs
Jeffrey Dodge, Navy
Tonya Moy (on behalf of Kirstin Faulkner), Historic Hawaii Foundation
Ross Stephenson, SHPD

Attending Consulting Parties (by phone)

Jerry Norris, OHA
Elaine-Jackson-Retondo, NPS
Betsy Merrit, NTHP
Hannah Keeler, NTHP
Terrance Ware, City/County



Meeting notes for

West O'ahu Station Group Community Presentation Review Section 106 Programmatic Agreement Consulting Parties Meeting

Date and Time: **June 15, 2011, 10:00 am**

Location: **RTD Office, Alii Place, 23rd Floor Conference Room**

Presentation

An overview of the project was presented, including a summary of current status, schedule and visual simulations. The West Oahu station group designs previously shown to the public in 2009 (including East Kapolei, UH West Oahu, and Ho'opili Stations) were shown, along with a summary of the comments received from the community during the workshops. Elements of a typical station were presented and explained and a video of the actual 2009 presentation made by Group 70 architects' Jeff Stone was shown.

Discussion

- It was asked if the final designer will be responsible for all stations or just the three within the West Oahu station group, and whether a master designer will be hired to examine system-wide design and integration. The response was that Ken Caswell's department will be responsible for system-wide design integration.
- It was asked if future community meetings would be combined with historic preservation meetings. The response was the City's intention is to hold future meetings as public meetings to gather input from all members of the community. That prompted concern about compliance with Secretary of Interior standards.
- It was suggested that special meetings with the consulting parties prior to the public meetings would be preferable. The response was that quarterly meetings with the consulting parties would continue.
- It was mentioned that the consulting parties are "not design or taste police," but are here to "analyze compatibility with community fabric." It was then stated that much discussion has occurred about station motifs, and that the concern is about the immediate built environment, e.g. surrounding buildings, and expressed a belief that the West Oahu stations are agriculturally/rurally based.
- It was pointed out that no historic buildings are in the West Oahu area. The response was that since there are no buildings in the West Oahu area, the station designs should tie into the history of the area.
- It was asked if the station design for the UHWO station ties into the design guidelines for the nearby campus.
- Some of the attendees had not seen the technical reports, design pattern book, and other materials which may have been distributed. RTD staff promised to make sure everyone had access to all relevant documents.
- It was expressed that the stations do not reflect the plantation era, and the design should pick an era to reflect. The reply was that the Waipahu community had expressed an interest in plantation-era designs, whereas the Kapolei community did not express such an affinity.
- It was noted that the designs attempt to reflect the natural existing land since no buildings currently exist. It was also noted that the stations are "not buildings," but rather are "simply structures to board trains."

- Concern was expressed about the balance between individuality of stations and the cohesiveness of the entire system. The reply was that the platform experience is consistent between stations, and that an art program will be consistent system-wide.
- There was an inquiry about visual signposting and wayfinding. The reply was that the station structures' size and visual identity is a clear "beacon" for wayfinding purposes, but that signage will also be present.
- There was a comment on the challenges of station scale, the lack of existing institutional models, and the need to create an indigenous architectural style.
- It was mentioned that HDR was chosen as the final designer for the Farrington Station group.
- Concern was expressed regarding the difficulty of finding design diagrams within the PE-level drawings that express scale versus renderings that show finishings and materials.
- It was indicated that massing and scale of the Farrington station group is being revisited. It was also explained that sugarcane plantation architecture had non-human scale to accommodate trucks, equipment, etc., but simplicity of design was key. Also noted was the difficulty of complying with 100-year flood requirements in Waipahu.
- It was recommended that as planning and design moves eastward into areas with greater historic context, more interaction with the consulting parties occur. It was suggested that the consulting parties be informed on how the designs are (or are not) meeting Secretary of Interior standards.
- It was recommended talking sooner rather than later about the design of stations at the Koko Head end of the alignment. As design of the West Oahu stations becomes established, the downtown stations will have to deal with precedents set by the previously-designed stations.
- Individual meetings and corridor tours were offered to anyone interested.
- It was mentioned to the group that this meeting conflicted with the Navy's teleconference calls, and suggested that future meetings be coordinated with Ellyn Goldkind of the Navy to avoid scheduling conflicts. Better coordination of meeting times was requested.

Attending Consulting Parties (in person)

Angie Westfall, State Historic Preservation Division
Amy Mutart, Hawaii Community Development Authority
Kiersten Faulkner, Historic Hawaii Foundation

Attending Consulting Parties (by phone)

Pua Aiu, State Historic Preservation Division
Gary Norris, Office of Hawaiian Affairs

Attending Project Staff (in person)

Mark Garrity, PB/GEC
Ken Caswell, RTD
Ryan Tam, RTD
Mike Yoshida, RTD
Bruce Nagao, RTD
Barbara Gilliland, PB/GEC
Faith Miyamoto, RTD
Tyler Dos Santos-Tam, PB/GEC

Stephanie Foell, PB/GEC
Denise McGeen, PB/GEC
Kelsey Britt, PB/GEC
Bill Foss, PB/GEC
Wayne Yoshioka, DTS
Dan Chun, Kauahikaua & Chun

Attending Project Staff (by phone)

Kanuji Parmar, PB/GEC



Meeting Summary

Historic Context Studies and Cultural Landscape Reports Initiation

Date and Time: **March 2, 2011, 10:00 am**

Location: **Ali'i Place, Honolulu, HI**

Presentation

The meeting purpose is to gather information; this is primarily a listening session. The project team will review, consider and prioritize the comments.

Definitions

- *Historic Context Studies* provide information on historic trends, grouped by theme, place and time. Also used as an organizing structure to evaluate the integrity of historic properties and determine their significance and potential National Register eligibility.
- *Cultural Landscape Reports* document four kinds of landscapes:
 - Designed—either by a master architect or an amateur
 - Vernacular—evolved through time; via use/occupancy of land
 - Historic sites—associated with event/activity or person
 - Ethnographic—defined by a people

Cultural landscape reports have management/treatment function, with information applied to considering character-defining features when making landscape treatment decisions.

Related Studies

- Historic Hawaii Foundation is conducting a modernism study which covers architecture, landscapes, engineering, and some public art over a period from 1939-1979, focusing on the period from 1947-1967.
- HHF would like to add someone from transit to the review group, and can also identify further research topics for transit studies.
- Methodology could be a model for HHCTCP studies. Contents and scope are completed. Project will be 80% completed by June; completion of the final study is anticipated in September, with a public symposium at the end of the year.
- Bibliography will include local and national resources (contact within worldwide movement); will include primary resources.
- Kamehameha Schools is doing a study on the ethno history of all of their properties as a precursor to redevelopment.

Historic Context Studies

- Can include stories/mythology; FTA and the City can bring in other resources and subject matter experts as needed when topics of study are identified.
- Historic context studies are linked to historic resources, but historic resources are not necessarily buildings or properties. For example, it would be possible to do a study on farming resources in Pearl City or agricultural themes in other phases of the project.
- Context studies can be used to inform cultural landscape reports if appropriate sites are identified; context studies would be thematic.

- The cultural landscapes reports and historic context studies are not necessarily bound by the area of potential effects (APE) for the Project; while Section 106 discussions are only focused on properties within the APE, the mitigation can address resources beyond the APE. This is an opportunity to think a little more broadly. Properties or sites discussed in the context studies do not have to be National Register listed or eligible. Part of the intent of context studies is to assist in assessing properties whose significance is currently unknown.
- Peer review is an important component of these studies and the City and FTA can identify subject matter experts to serve as reviewers to make sure work is of the highest quality.

Concerns

- Need a concise, detailed study of the historic resources along the route (this has been needed for two years).
- Knowing the specific mo'olelo (stories/history) should be done before construction begins (groundbreaking).
- OIBC remains concerned about archaeological issues (burials: prehistoric or historic—burials appear to be most likely in corridor three and four; options to preserve in place and use technology could be explored).
- We need to have honor and integrity; many projects just went to the letter of the law, rather than the intent.
- OHA feels that it is important to the Hawaiian people that the project decision makers are committed to include Hawaiian historic resources in these cultural reports, even though there are no listed historic properties within the APE.

Discussion

- Consider a pre-contact theme; documenting stories, places, and names. Look at pre-contact history, indigenous epistemology and how it relates to traditional historic resources management. Consider the era/timeframes and how they affect the study.
- Consider use-periods as a way to organize the study. For example: the use of single-wall construction in post-contact Hawaii is not associated with a specific era/time, but has to do with a building style. It may or may not be appropriate.
- Look at the role of a place in history (not necessarily buildings). For example, springs could be important. Context studies can identify geographic places and also tell the stories associated with those places.
- Ideas for station-area context studies: Develop mini-neighborhood context studies around each station/node (we would need sufficient differentiation amongst the 21 stations). We could also craft an overarching context study which is likely to cover each station and could use early American themes for context. For example, Pu'uloa and the focus on agricultural and Waiawa-fields used for makahiki games. Other themes could include:
 - Burial types
 - Agricultural activities
 - Infrastructure development (for example, a modern road that began as a traditional trail)
 - Different political eras

- Note: themes in native Hawaiian culture aren't necessarily separated into discrete components but are interrelated/interwoven
 - Need to identify parts of the Hawaiian culture that need to be studied
 - Culturally-guiding way to talk about transportation could be to talk about traditional land divisions (ahupua'a)
 - Other potential themes could be by era, technological advance, settlement
 - Can do prehistoric and post-contact studies for historic context studies
- Consider social and cultural history as an expression of a place
 - A study on the Hawaiian Renaissance of the 1970s, for example, could look at Kaho'olawe, the sovereignty movement
 - Highlight specific individuals of importance; could include oral histories
- Discuss how this project is part of an ongoing (evolving) continuum
 - This project is not just about the past; it is also about the future
 - History is important because the Programmatic Agreement promotes preservation and restoration
- Pay careful attention to the scope/methodology used to integrate geographical, place-based knowledge that is not easily found in secondary documents.
 - For example: the myth of Mākua valley described the "mo'o wahine", a lizard goddess who was said to be present if the water was green; this myth actually explained an algae bloom.
 - Need enough data/research to tell a rich and vivid story along the route
 - Writings of John Papa I'i could be a good resource
 - Look at fire insurance maps as a potential resource
- Consider traditional place names and history
 - Place names affect what in history is honored/perpetuated/highlighted
 - In the Hawaiian context, the place names have changed dramatically: i.e. traditional name for Pearl Harbor is Pu'uloa
 - Some ahupua'a names within Honolulu / Kona (south / Kou (east to west) include: Mauna-lua, Kuli'ou'ou, Niu, Wailupe, Waikiki, Wai'alae Nui, Wai'alae Iki,
 - Pālolo, Mānoa, Makiki, Pauoa, Nu'uanu, Kapālama, Kalihi, Kahauiki, Moanalua; another name for Chinatown is Ulu kohaeau
 - Determine from which time era the ahupua'a names are used
- Integration of Historical Materials into Stations
 - Identified in the PA
 - Vision: each station is like walking into a mini-Bishop museum; like a school, keaukahiko, keauhou. Example from Athens subway; very successful at paying homage to the history while still being very modern. Stations incorporated windows into excavation sites, used a lot of signage; modern art; thematic displays based on engineering and transportation—aqueducts

- Each station should have a name reflective of a place, not a post-contact name.
- Goal is to educate/advocate Hawaiian community. Consider burials as part of this educational context. Also look at how the transit stations (nodes) relate to their surrounding communities.

List of Potential Themes

- Agriculture
 - Consider the agricultural context, including different types of agriculture
 - Native Hawaiian subsistence in Honouliuli, but also small commercial farms, such as small agricultural areas in the Pearl City Peninsula
 - Include aquaculture: Post-plantation period included fishponds in Pearl Harbor and the Moanalua area
- Land Divisions
 - By Moku / Ahupua'a
 - By watersheds
- Engineering
 - Water systems, utilities, plantation irrigation, 'auwai Military engineering—fuel distribution, water systems, Red Hill water system; Pearl City area
 - Military context study/impact of military presence
- Industrial Base
 - Economics, occupations, development of different sectors
 - Shipyard, pineapple, old railroads, growth of the service industry, finance
- Travel corridors; OR&L line
 - O'ahu Railway and Land Company
 - Significant impact on Hawaii; OR&L determined the location of the mills, which then determined the location of the villages
 - Pu'uloa station was a key station on the line
 - OR&L archives (ledgers, etc) are kept at the Waipahu plantation village, but are in poor condition
 - Other trails/corridor paths (Native Hawaiian)
 - Purpose of travel
 - Rapid transit hula linked the tow moku; Brothers Cazimero
 - Consider the context from the travelers; point of view; what would the travelers see (rails, trails, etc.)
- Airport
 - Impact of jet travel
- Ocean or water-based recreation
 - Kaka'ako and Point Panic as a historic site
 - Historic context on surfing and/or other water recreation

- Construction methods and materials
 - Masonry; lava rock; coral block
 - Concrete construction (first concrete building in the United States was built in Hawaii)
- Development of housing and living areas
 - Subdivision of land and housing developments (mid-century)
 - Settlements before the military and plantation villages
 - Kau-Hale, living systems
- Community life—social communities
 - Social component to housing; social /class system is obvious
 - Social justice issues related to communities in Leeward O‘ahu

Implementation / Next Steps

- No other project has the potential to be such a trend setter; this will be one of the most prominent in the United States
- There is an opportunity to have a positive project; it is a paradigm for change
- As we learn about these practices, the project should preserve, restore what we find (even outside the project Area of Potential Effect)
- Fishpond / practice / springs may not exist today, but we can tell the story

Research can be used as a source material for other activities

- Information from historic context studies will inform other products required in the stipulations, such as National Register nominations and interpretive products
- Research can also be used for other educational components of this project. (humanities program), but also for other projects or products completed independently of the Project.
- Project needs to actively disseminate this research, so that it can be used by schools, nonprofits, communities; FTA and the City are committed to public education using research resulting from the project.

The project will also create an historic resources database as part of the PA

- The technology will use an interactive project map and work produced as part of the project will be linked to the map and be available (unless archaeologically sensitive).
- Database will also be useful for the research community beyond the project
- Because of the many ideas shared for the historic context studies, conversations about cultural landscape reports will need to be continued in another meeting
- Project team does not have preconceived notions; unknown if landscapes are important until they are analyzed.
- It is possible that some landscapes recommended as traditional cultural properties (which are being addressed in a separate set of meetings) may not meet the National Register criteria, but could potentially be incorporated into the historic context study.
- Describe connection between TCPs and CLRs.

Attending Consulting Parties

Ellyn Goldkind, Navy
Ross Stephenson, SHPD
Keola Lindsay, OHA
Jean Rasor
Kehau Watson
Wendy Wichman
Kiersten Faulkner, HHF
Hilarie Alomar
Hinaleimoana Falemei, OIBC
Mahealani Cypher, O'ahu Civic Clubs

Attending (project/city staff)

Faith Miyamoto, RTD
Kaleo Patterson, RTD
Ryan Tam, RTD
Bruce Nagao, RTD
Barbara Gilliland, PB
Stephanie Foell, PB
Glenn Mason, Mason
Polly Tice, Mason
Terrance Ware, City/County



Meeting Summary

Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) Historic Context Studies and Cultural Landscape Reports Follow-Up Meeting

Date and Time: **April 7, 2011, 10:00 am**

Location: **Ali'i Place, Honolulu, HI**

Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Continue cultural landscape reports discussions to identify specific sites for potential study.
- Discuss the outline and progress on developing concepts for the ahupua'a historic context study.

Concerns

The issues raised in the Office of Hawaiian Affairs letter of March 7, 2011, were discussed and clarified. FTA is preparing a formal response to the letter.

The consulting parties also highlighted their expectation that the forthcoming interpretive program, which will be informed by the historic context study, should be used to promote understanding of Native Hawaiian history and not be just seen as ornamental addition. They also expressed a desire to embrace technology to explore new and groundbreaking ways to educate transit riders.

Discussion

I. Responses to OHA letter

FTA is preparing a written response to OHA's letter, but Stephanie Foell responded verbally to their concerns. She pointed out the importance of the historic context study because it will provide a foundation for subsequent interpretive work. The historic context studies and cultural landscape reports are not limited to discuss, study, or address only sites within the project's Area of Potential Effects (APE). Sites outside of the APE but in the project's vicinity can be included in these studies. Places included in the historic context study do not need to be listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). It is possible that landscapes studied for the cultural landscape reports may be eligible for the NRHP, but prior determinations are not a requirement. She also clarified that the forthcoming interpretive plan is a way to extend the work of historic context research into the community, and is not a substitute for Native Hawaiian history, places, and cultural traditions to be included in the proposed historic context study and possible cultural landscape reports, when these sites are selected for study.

II. Review of Cultural Landscape Reports

Stephanie provided a summary of the relevant points related to selecting sites for cultural landscape reports. Types of cultural landscapes include history sites, designed landscapes, vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic landscapes. Although cultural landscape reports address current description/conditions; site history and evolution; and character-defining features, the reports are ultimately a treatment plan. The City would like to identify sites with property owners or landscape stewards that would be receptive to the studies and are in a position to implement recommendations. Landscapes that do not have identified stakeholders to implement recommendations can potentially be included as part of the historic context studies and other interpretive products.

The group discussed possible sites for cultural landscape reports. Sites identified for potential study include:

- Hono'uli'uli – Japanese Internment Camp
- Iolani Palace/Capitol District
- Mother Waldron Park
- Natatorium
- Thomas Square
- Banana patch
- Ma'o Farms
- Makalapa
- Mo'iili'iili four story walk-ups
- Fishpond study at Pearl Harbor (research pre-1883 at Pearl Harbor)
- Watercress Farms
- Dole Pineapple
- Kaumakapili Church
- (former) Pakakau Heiau (Queen Street. Became Ft. Armstrong later on)
- Waipahu area plantation town
- Petroglyph Field
- Leeward Community College Cemetery
- Blaisdell Park (where iwi washed up after tsunami)
- Moanalua Gardens
- Puowaina/Punchbowl
- Pu'u Kapolei (now archery range)
- Liliha Healing Springs
- Nuuanu Auwai System

The City will review this list to identify those sites that are in the project vicinity and also have receptive owners/entities that would implement treatment recommendations. The City will then prioritize the list to determine which sites would most likely influence change and also insure the best investment of time, effort, and funds. The group agreed that while many cultural landscapes may have important histories—which can be incorporated into the historic context study and interpretive work—the sites selected for cultural landscape reports need to have an appropriate level of integrity to convey the reasons why they are historically significant.

III. Historic Context Study

Stephanie introduced the draft outline for the proposed historic context study, which will address various pre-contact and post-contact historic themes for the ahupua'a that the project will bisect. She stated that the document should have a sound scholarly basis and the City will contact appropriate experts to contribute to the study and/or serve on a proposed review panel. The group agreed that the study will

contain an appropriate level of detail, but will not be intensive-level in all areas. In some instances, certain themes and topics will prove more relevant for some ahupua'a than others. At this time, the City believes the study will be organized geographically and chronologically. Information in the historic context study will serve as a foundation for other deliverables required in the Programmatic Agreement, such as the interpretive work and also the National Register of Historic Places documentation and HABS/HAER/HALS recordation.

The City pointed out that the boundaries of the historic context study are the ahupua'a, but that the project's Area of Potential Effects is a separate element that is not being expanded.

OIBC stated that they continue to have concerns about the presence of iwi kupuna within the project area and are participating in the consultation process to make sure those concerns continue to be discussed. OIBC hopes that the project will provide landmark opportunities to educate the traveling public about Hawaiian history and culture, which should not be trivialized or ornamental. The use of Native Hawaiian place names and language in project signage is highly desirable. The City should be aware that these efforts may have income-producing potential for the project.

The group briefly discussed ways that the historic context study will inform the interpretive plan, including incorporating information and historic photographs. The group was interested in the potential for incorporating technological components, such as iPhone apps and interactive ways for citizens to share their stories and memories about areas within the project vicinity. The consulting parties expressed a strong sentiment to have the interpretive work for this project set a new standard in education and opportunity in Hawaii and also in the United States.

Implementation / Next Steps

The City will review the sites identified by the consulting parties for potential cultural landscape reports and determine which have willing recipients and are the best candidates for study. The City will then circulate that list to the consulting parties for comment prior to making any selections. The City will also commence research on the historic context study with the goal of preparing a more detailed outline followed by a sample chapter or portion of text for consulting party review. Efforts to identify subject-matter experts to contribute formally or as research resources will also continue and will be informed by the Traditional Cultural Properties research as well.

Attending Signatories and Consulting Parties

Ellyn Goldkind, NAVFAC HI, Navy
Keola Lindsey, OHA
Jerry Norris, OHA
Kiersten Faulkner, HHF
Hinaleimoana Falemei, OIBC
Mahealani Cypher, O'ahu Civic Clubs

Attending (project/city staff)

Faith Miyamoto, RTD
Ryan Tam, RTD
Barbara Gilliland, PB
Stephanie Foell, PB
Ted Matley (FTA)



Meeting Minutes

Interpretive Plan Kick-off

Date and Time: **July 7, 2011, 11:30 am**

Location: **Ali`i Place, 23rd Floor Conference Room**

Stipulation VII of the project's Programmatic Agreement was introduced, which calls for development and implementation of an interpretive plan. The focus of the meeting was to begin discussion of interpretive components such as signage, materials and exhibits in stations.

Presentation

A PowerPoint presentation provided an overview of general interpretive concepts and examples of exhibits and materials used in transit systems throughout the United States and abroad.

Discussion

- Cultural appropriateness and integrity is critical; interpretation should contain an appropriate level of detail.
- There may be the need for at least three languages (Hawaiian, English and Japanese; perhaps others appropriate to Hawai`i).
- The use of Native Hawaiian place names for the station names and/or reference to the Ahupua`a in which they are located is highly desirable; Individual station interpretation and artwork could be based on relevant Ahupua`a.
- General interest in cultural mural concept accompanied with sensory stimulation; murals have opportunity to tell story.
- Efforts should be made to have interactive components (visceral and/or sensory). Auditory components such as iPhone Apps and kiosks could be incorporated in addition to visual art and other interactive ways of sharing authentic Hawaiian stories and memories about areas located within the project vicinity.
- Interactive components should be at the stations and considered within the train cars themselves.
- Interpretive components should be included near system maps since that is a critical location within transit stations.

Stephanie Foell

- Critical that all information conveyed is historically accurate and vetted; efforts to avoid trivializing history and treating topic with respect and dignity are of paramount importance to the project team.

Gary Omori

- Suggests reviewing existing interpretation in Honolulu and throughout Hawai`i (e.g. Honolulu International Airport and Bishop Museum).

Eddie Akana

- Tourists have curiosity about Hawai`i. Interpretation should be exciting and entertaining to engage interest.

Jennifer Murphy

- The City is developing a station art program that addresses pre- and post-historic contact. The three major components the program may address are:
 1. **Loia** (customs and culture)
 2. **Aloha 'Aina** (love of the land)
 3. **Mo'olelo** (stories)
- Most storytelling was done through chants, hula or oral stories. The vision of the art program is to use art to tell stories of the Hawaiian history, culture and spiritual connection with the land.

Mahealani Cypher

- Suggests incorporating a Hawaiian phrase-of-the-day (mo'olelo or olelo no'eau) to educate transit riders on Hawaiian language and culture.
- Inquired whether stations would be of the same size and/or design? Ken Caswell responded that stations will be in a variety of configurations and most will be open-aired and/or not fully enclosed, which limits available wall space to exhibit artwork.

Jean Rasor

- Liked the concept of interactive components and suggests rotating exhibits throughout the stations so that all patrons can access and/or experience interpretive programming.

Hinaleimoana Falemei

- Sustainability and marketing are important but should not be the only components.
- Hawaiian culture/history is not "for sale" but recognizes this program as an opportunity to showcase the Hawaiian culture and create a world-class, transit-oriented interpretive experience. Should stay away from the commercialized Hawai'i interpreted by tourism.
- Program presents an opportunity to promote cultural integrity; when authentically conveyed, Hawaiian history is highly marketable.
- Suggests visiting the Imiloa Museum on the island of Hawai'i, which provides good examples of cultural and educational tools and provides cultural insight on many levels.
- Interpretation should be unbiased and relate to "cold, hard" facts.
- Supports the project as an opportunity to educate visitors and residents alike on Hawai'i's authentic culture and history—the actual story of Hawai'i from the ancient period to the monarchy and to present day.

Kainaloa Koko

- Suggested developing interactive/digital maps identifying historically and culturally significant locations.

Nālani

- Appreciate the consulting parties and their contribution to the interpretive plan; we look forward to working with them on the cultural and historical integrity and accuracy.

*** Meeting adjourned at 1:15pm ***

Attending Signatories and Consulting Parties

Edward Akana, Royal Order of Kamehameha
Hinaleimoana Falemei, O'ahu Island Burial Council
Jean Rasor, Royal Order of Kamehameha
Joseph K. Lewis, Office of Hawaiian Affairs
Kahu Manu Mook
Kanaloa Koko, Royal Order of Kamehameha
Keola Lindsey, Office of Hawaiian Affairs
Kiersten Faulkner, Historic Hawaii Foundation
Mahealani Cypher, Hawaiian Civic Clubs - O'ahu
Ted Matley, Federal Transit Administration

Attending Project Staff

Barbara Gilliland
Denise McGeen
Faith Miyamoto
Gary Omori
Jeanne Mariani-Belding
Jennifer Murphy
Josh Silva
Kaleo Patterson
Kelsey Britt
Ken Caswell
Matt Derby
Matt McDaniel
Nālani Dahl
Stephanie Foell



Meeting notes for

Historic Preservation Committee Section 106 Programmatic Agreement

Date and Time: July 8, 2011

Location: HART Office, Ali'i Place

Introduction

Barbara Gilliland started the meeting by discussing the stipulation set forth in the Honolulu Rail Transit Project's Programmatic Agreement (PA) that requires the Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) formation. The HPC is responsible for overseeing a \$2 million fund for exterior improvements to historic properties within the Project's Area of Potential Effects. Historic properties are those that have been determined eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The purpose of the meeting is for HPC members to gain a clear understanding of responsibilities and articulate any initial thoughts on approaches to managing the committee's responsibilities. Members were provided with a notebook with contact information for members; language from PA Stipulation IX.B relating to the committee; background information and maps on identified historic resources in the corridor; legal references for governing laws such as the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, and ROH Chapter 6, Article 29, as amended.

The group members then introduced themselves and Gilliland presented a brief PowerPoint presentation.

Discussion

The HPC discussed the intent of their role, which is to provide funding for historically appropriate exterior improvements to historic properties. Exterior improvements provide for a public benefit, which interior improvements do not.

The committee members discussed several topics related to the management of this program.

Timing: The PA provides for an outreach program and educational effort for historic property owners and the greater public. HPC members agreed that these efforts should be initiated to raise awareness and potentially increase participation in the HPC fund.

Funding: HPC members discussed experiences with similar initiatives and generally agreed that awards could range from \$10,000-\$200,000. The group does not intend to fund one or two large projects, but rather a number of smaller projects. Funds should not be used to develop plans or for consultants, but to execute "bricks and mortar" preservation efforts. Historic preservation-related components of larger projects would be considered for funding.

HPC members discussed the potential for applicants to provide matching funds in either dollars or sweat equity. The potential exists for property owners to layer historic preservation tax credits as part of the HPC allocations to realize economic incentives related to historic preservation.

The group agreed that other PA stipulations addressed documentation and improvements to parks, so the focus of their efforts would be on built historic properties.

Project Selection: The group agreed to explore a two-tier proposal system, with an initial short proposal, followed by a more detailed proposal. The HPC may offer support or assistance in preparing the second application. The HPC will develop clear and defensible selection criteria

to evaluate and prioritize proposals. Criteria may include significance and condition of historic properties; integrity; ownership; and commitment to maintain character-defining features and not demolish properties after awards.

Project Monitoring: The group agreed that there needed to be some monitoring to determine that work will be executed as outlined in the proposal. Monitoring may include historic appropriateness of work; timeliness of work and expenditures; making work subject to a final inspection; and requiring progress reports and/or a final report. Receiving award funds may be subject to receiving appropriate permits.

Next Steps

- Prior to the next meeting, the City will draft initial Guidelines/Program Description for the HPC to review and revise.
- HPC members agreed to initially schedule meetings as needed, although regularly scheduled meetings may be required in the future.
- The next meeting is scheduled for September 12, 2011.

HPC Members in Attendance

Toru Hamayasu, Interim Executive Director, HART, Chair
David Tanoue, Director, Department of Permitting and Planning, City and County of Honolulu
Kiersten Faulkner, Executive Director, Historic Hawaii Foundation
Mahealani Cypher, O'ahu Council, Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs
Dana Yee, American Society of Landscape Architects

Absent:

Bruce Nagao, HART

Angie R. Westfall, Architectural Branch Chief, State Historic Preservation Division

Project Staff

Faith Miyamoto, HART

Elizabeth Scanlon, HART

Barbara Gilliland, PB

Stephanie Foell, PB

Nalani Dahl, PB

Glenn Mason, Mason Architects

Ann Yoklavich, Mason Architects



Meeting Summary

Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) Quarterly Meeting April 2011

Date and Time: **April 14, 2011, 10:00 am**

Location: **Ali'i Place, Honolulu, HI**

Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to review progress executing work required in the Programmatic Agreement within the first 90 days. The attached materials were distributed for the discussion included a summary overview of the activities since January and the milestone schedule developed related to the agreement.

Concerns

The City and project team needs to actively solicit local Hawaiian cultural and historic expertise to incorporate adequate representation and reflection of native Hawaiian concepts and background in planning and execution of PA deliverables.

The Navy expressed a concern that the consultation process should be clear in responding to Section 106 requirements versus those that should be addressed as part of other environmental mitigation.

Discussion

I. Roles and Responsibilities

It was noted that one of the intents of the City Architectural Historian position is the coordination between internal city departments and the consulting parties on PA issues. The group was interested in understanding how this coordination is being conducted. Responding to this question, the City and its consultants are currently coordinating with DTS and DPP related to several topics including the establishment of the baseline for demolition permit monitoring and establishment of the Historic Preservation Committee. For stipulations requiring specialized Secretary of Interior Professional Qualifications Standards, Stephanie Foell from the City's General Engineering Consultant (GEC), Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB), represents and coordinates the City's interests and responsibilities.

II. Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP)

A kickoff meeting was held on February 12, 2011 and a scope of work is under development for the study. The group expressed an interest in the use of an ethnographer familiar with Hawaiian culture and language should be hired. This person(s) can be teamed with other experts familiar with Section 106 and/or who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards to complete the study.

III. Archaeological Sites and Burials

Phase 1: Archaeological inventory survey plan (AISP), survey (AIS) and data recovery plan have been submitted to the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) and approved. A Draft Data Recovery Plan for lo'i sediments were found in the Waipahu Transit Center is under review by SHPD.

Phase 2: AISP approved by SHPD and AIS nearly complete. Completion of the survey is pending access to two private properties.

Phase 3: Draft AISP will be prepared in May. AIS to begin in October.

Phase 4: A kickoff meeting was held on March 16th with OIBC, lineal and cultural descendents, NHOs and other interested parties. Additional individual follow up has occurred since the meeting in developing the Draft AISP. The draft is due to SHPD May 18, 2011. AIS will begin in September.

The Navy indicated that it will be important to coordinate with them early on any site excavations that may be required on their property.

IV. Design Standards

Preliminary engineering drawings were provided to the consulting parties for their review on February 25, 2011. A staged review was proposed giving the group until April 30 to submit comments, 30 days longer than identified in the PA.

There is some concern that station designs need to be sensitive to the historic context of the areas affected. There is an interest in understanding what is possible related to the designs, exactly what is possible to change and what cannot. The discussion summarized the work done to date related to establishing station footprints. Preliminary design concepts have been developed based upon community workshops to get a sense of the interests of the local community. Reflections from the community as well as input and specific recommendations received to date from the consulting parties will be considered in future designs. Designers will be challenged by striking the right balance of historic setting, community input and Hawaiian interests. Discussions among the consulting parties demonstrated that some prefer to have a consistent station design throughout the system while others prefer unique designs that respond to each community's architectural vocabulary and setting.

V. Recordation and Documentation

Two meetings were held to begin identification of possible historic context studies and cultural landscape reports; March 2 and April 7, 2011. Work related to this stipulation included the development of an outline for a historic context study (HCS) that will focus on the linear impact of the project through each moku and ahupua'a along the project. In addition, several potential sites for cultural landscape reports (CLR) were provided by the consulting parties. These suggestions are under review and a general scope of work outline for identifying report content will be shared with the consulting parties by 4/18.

Also discussed was the inter-relationship between the TCP work, AIS work and the HCS and CLR products. The City will work to provide good coordination to avoid duplication of effort. In addition, Hawaiian experts should be engaged to help guide the development of the work. The City proposes to establish a review committee for the HCS to provide guidance and feedback as the work proceeds.

In addition, a letter has been sent to the National Park Service to request identification of adversely affected eligible or listed historic properties to receive HABS/HAER/HALS (HHH) documentation.

VI. National Register Nominations

A letter has been sent to the Navy requesting the approval to update the Pearl Harbor National Historic Landmark (NHL) and CINCPAC Headquarters Building NHL nominations. The Navy consulting party participant, Eilyn Goldkind, requested that she be copied electronically on Navy correspondence so responses are not delayed.

Staff confirmed that a searchable GIS database of historic properties is under development.

VII. Educational and Interpretive Programs

During prior meetings, consulting parties and the City have agreed that information gathered during the HCS and station design consultations will likely inform components of the interpretive plan. After initial conversation with the design team a kickoff meeting is anticipated during the next 90 days to begin outlining the approach and develop the interpretive plan for this stipulation.

VIII. Mitigation for Specific Historic Properties

To date, only initial discussions have taken place related to Mother Waldron Park as a possible subject for a CLR. Some clarification was requested regarding which parks that would be reviewed and how impacts to recently constructed parks such as the new Kolowalu (Queen Street) would be addressed. The City noted that parks that are not eligible or listed are not Section 106 historic properties, but impacts to them have been considered from a NEPA perspective.

This generated a discussion related to what historic resources, including adversely affected parks, should be included as part of the Section 106 consultation and mitigation versus those that may be a part of other environmental mitigation. It was noted that there is a need to follow Section 106 studies completed to date, but that there may be instances when specific pre-historic or native Hawaiian impacts may be identified that will need to be addressed. There is a concern expressed by the Navy that any funding identified for Section 106 mitigation should be applied only to adversely affected historic resources. The City noted that the current work related to the Programmatic Agreement is a part of the Section 106 requirements and any additional mitigation will be developed in consultation with the consulting parties.

IX. Measures to Address Indirect and Cumulative Effects

Nongovernmental candidates for the Historic Preservation Committee have been identified and were circulated to SHPD for review. A meeting date has been set in June to kick off the work related to the two million dollars that has been set aside for the historic preservation fund. Individual committee members will be finalized over the next month.

There were no additional comments or discussion of the remaining PA stipulations or related to the milestones schedule beyond what was presented in the first 90-day summary.

Implementation / Next Steps

Next quarterly meeting will be in July, 2011 and will include the circulation of the first semi-annual progress report. The project team is reviewing the activities for the next 90 days and will be circulating a proposed schedule for additional meetings in the next two weeks.

Attending Signatories and Consulting Parties

Ellyn Goldkind, NAVFAC HI, Navy
Pua Aiu, SHPD
Blythe Semmer, ACHP
Charleen Dwin Vaughan, ACHP
Melia Lane-Kamahele, NPS
Betsy Merritt, NTHP
Deepak Neupane, HCDA
Jerry Norris, OHA
Kiersten Faulkner, HHF
Hinaleimoana Falemei, OIBC
Mahealani Cypher, O'ahu Civic Clubs

Attending (project/city staff)

Faith Miyamoto, RTD
Judy Aranda, RTD
Ryan Tam, RTD
Jeanne Mariani-Belding, RTD
Barbara Gilliland, PB
Stephanie Foell, PB
Amy Zaref, PB
Jim Van Epps, PB
Mark Garrity, PB



Meeting Summary

2nd Quarterly Consulting Parties Review

Date and Time: **July 14, 2011, 10:00 am**

Location: **Alī'i Place, 23rd Floor Ewa Conference Room**

Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss ongoing implementation of the Programmatic Agreement.

Discussion

I. Roles and Responsibilities

The City initiated the hiring process to fill the Programmatic Agreement (PA) Project Manager (Kako'o) position. The City released a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the position on May 19, 2011 and proposals were received on June 20, 2011. The procurement is being done in two parts. RFP Part I nearly complete; the City completing reference checks and evaluating submittals. RFP Part II will be issued to listed offerors on July 18, 2011. Technical proposals due on August 18, 2011. The execution of contract and notice to proceed is scheduled for September 29, 2011.

II. Traditional Cultural Properties

SRI Foundation has been retained to assist the City and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) with the traditional cultural properties (TCPs) study, which will determine the presence of previously unidentified TCPs within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) as defined in the PA. The TCP study team includes Martha Graham and David Cushman of SRI Foundation and Kepa and Onaona Maly of Kumu Pono Associates. In addition to the outreach meetings held on February 12, 2011 and June 22, 2011, Kumu Pono has been conducting historical background research; the goal is for the research to complement work previously done for the project, filling in some gaps that Kumu Pono has identified and adding information from Hawaiian language resources. Kumu Pono has identified several hundred maps and documents to date and is in the process of transcribing them; most of these documents date back between the 1820's and the early 1900's. The next step in the process is to translate the Hawaiian language documents and to continue to elicit names of knowledgeable Native Hawaiians and begin interviews. Kim Evans added that Kumu Pono will also be discussing 'iwi kūpuna and interviewee's thoughts and recommendations about what should happen if any 'iwi are encountered during construction. While we hope to be as inclusive as possible, our first priority is to identify and interview elderly kama'aina and those who have first or second-hand knowledge of places on the landscape—whose knowledge might soon be gone.

III. Identification and Protection of Archaeological Sites and Burials

Phase 1 (WOFH): The Archaeological Inventory Survey (AIS) Report has been submitted to and approved by State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD). A Data Recovery Plan for lo'i sediments found at Waipahu Transit Center has been submitted and approved.

Phase 2 (KHG): AIS Plan approved by SHPD and AIS Report nearing completion; completion pending access to two private properties.

Phase 3 (Airport): AISP in development; trenching work to commence in October 2011

Phase 4 (City Center): AISP has been submitted to SHPD for review; trenching work to commence in September 2011.

The Burial Consultation Protocol is under internal review and will be posted the week of July 18, 2011 to begin the formal review period with O'ahu Island Burial Council (OIBC), Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs) and cultural and lineal descendants.

Hinaleimoana Falemei

- Burial finds should be addressed now; OIBC will continue to be involved with the process to ensure that any and all concerns are being addressed; burial finds are spiritual and would be very problematic if not handled correctly.

The City will finalize the semi-annual report in the next couple of weeks as required by the PA. This report will document all the information gathered and shared and documents all that has been completed over the past six months.

IV. Design Standards

The City posted the *Design Language Pattern Book* on the project website and also provided the consulting parties with the preliminary design plans completed for the project. Three consulting parties provided comments on preliminary station designs; responses to those comments are under development and will be posted to the PA site for review.

The City plans to conduct additional meetings as the final design process continues. Tentative meeting schedule is posted on the project website. Comments from these meetings will be considered and posted as station designs evolve.

Within the next 90 days we will hold a workshop, which focuses on those stations near historic resources.

Ellyn Goldkind

- There are engineering issues from the last quarterly meeting that have not been responded to/addressed. The Navy has requested that their concerns be addressed and coordination occurs as soon as possible.

V. Recordation and Documentation

An initial draft text sample (Appendix A) for the proposed Historic Context Study (HCS) was provided, which will address various pre-contact and post-contact historic themes for the ahupua'a the project will bisect. Feedback on overall tone, level of detail, content and approach was solicited; group was encouraged to share sample text with others. Comments will be considered for ongoing development of the report. The City anticipates the HCS to be a two to three year effort; ongoing work will include conducting intensive research, writing, and photography/illustration.

Kim Evans

- Incorporate a tone of honor and respect in addition to basic description and facts; what did we learn from this? How does it apply?
- Include *oli* (chants) or *mele* (songs) that celebrate a particular place.
- How would we access information to share back to the residents and/or property owners; this is bigger than the scope—it's building relationships

Kaleo Patterson

- There should be cultural/spiritual stories rather than "mythology." Myths are not words that many of us would use to describe something. Public schools use mo'olelo; we discuss from a cultural perspective—not just descriptive.

- It's important that we not perpetuate content that has been discredited; watch where we take expired material.

Ellyn Goldkind

- Organization is key; it should be searchable via an index.
- The essence is missing; what is the hierarchy? If there's a way to highlight that in the beginning it'd be useful and we'll see themes emerging.
- Suggests incorporating images.
- Wondered if there's a standard format. She has concerns with the document being too large; it's important that it be easy for readers to understand.

Wendy Wichman

- Will the product be searchable? An index is desirable and would serve useful.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo

- Citations: use NRHP guidelines (i.e. Chicago)

Stephanie Foell reiterated the intent is for the document to be academic, scholarly, readable and approachable, and we hope for it to be heavily illustrated. Ellyn indicated that it's imperative all this be defined in the scope.

Efforts have been made to form a guidance/review panel to be used in the evaluation of the HCS to maintain high accuracy and quality standards; ethnic representation is desirable.

Kaleo Patterson

- Recommends engaging with the Hawaiian Civic Clubs and OHA's Historic Preservation Committee.

Kanaloa Koko

- Recommends using the Hawaiian Forestry website, which has genealogy information and history of who lived where and to also contact SHPD for other sources to consider.

A list of sites identified for potential cultural landscape report (CLR) documentation (Appendix B) was provided. Project staff received a robust list and prioritized to determine which sites would most likely ensure the best investment of time, effort and funds. The group agreed that sites selected for CLR need to have an appropriate level of integrity to convey the reasons why they are historically significant, which will be outlined in the report. The list includes Mother Waldron Park and Irwin Park.

Ellyn Goldkind

- Concerned with why Makalapa and the Fishpond at Pearl Harbor were eliminated; Navy feels the fishpond needs additional research.
- Suggests creating a matrix, which highlights areas considered, who was contacted, research completed, why it was eliminated and information captured so as to avoid revising the context study, given that a lot of sites will be part of the HCS.

Wendy Wichman

- Wondered why the Ala Wai wasn't considered. Response to 300 individual owners would require a significant level of effort.

Kaleo Patterson

- Advised that Blaisdell Park follows an old fishpond footprint, which could be further researched.

The City sent a letter to the National Park Service (NPS) on May 25, 2011 to request identification of adversely affected eligible or listed historic properties to receive HABS/HAER/HALS (HHH) documentation and received a response on June 29, 2011. The City will continue to coordinate with NPS on the properties to receive HHH documentation.

The City will hire a photographer/videographer to complete required photography for all adversely effected historic properties in areas where construction will occur in the next six months; the City will also engage with this photographer to document the project corridor prior to construction commencement.

VI. National Register Historic Places/National Historic Landmark Nominations

The City will continue to coordinate with the Navy for approval to update the Pearl Harbor National Historic Landmark (NHL) and CINCPAQ Headquarters Building NHL nominations.

The City is currently negotiating a contract to complete a National Register nomination for the Hono'uli'uli Stream Bridge.

PB systems analysts, programmers, and project visualization staff continue to develop and populate a web-based map that includes searchable, interactive database of historic properties within the APE. Development of the interactive database will continue. A demonstration will be given at the next meeting.

Navy Request

Ellyn Goldkind

- Land transfer for Makalapa may require a separate 106 requirement to a non-Navy entity. Need to further explore the Federal requirements. Also related to Topic VI-National Register. When will the city plan to update the NHL?

VII. Educational and Interpretive Programs, Materials and Signage

The City hosted a kick-off meeting on July 7, 2011 to begin developing the interpretive plan. The City presented an overview of general interpretive concepts and examples of exhibits and materials used in transit systems throughout the United States and abroad for consulting parties' consideration.

The City will continue to collect information gathered under the PA that will inform components of the interpretive plan, humanities program, and education programs. The City will also coordinate with its architects during final design regarding station components related to signage, displays or other interpretive features.

Hinaleimoana Falemei

- It's imperative that not only Federal expectations be met but also that of the Native Hawaiian community.

Kanaloa Koko

- Will there be a trolley stop at stations where tourists can access interpretive components and experience Hawaii in a different way?
- Recommends developing a weekend of tours.

VIII. Mitigation for Specific Historic Properties

At this time, the City is proposing Mother Waldron Park and Irwin Park to be considered for CLR documentation. If selected, the recommendations/treatment plans set forth in CLRs could be incorporated into the park improvement plan and executed using park improvement funds.

IX. Measures to Address Reasonably Foreseeable Indirect and Cumulative Effects Caused by the Project

The City has created the Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) according to requirements of this stipulation. The HPC held a kick-off meeting on July 8, 2011 to begin the selection of historic building improvements and the allocation of the \$2 million fund for exterior (façade) improvements.

Members of HPC include:

- Toru Hamayasu—HART
- Bruce Nagao—HART
- David Tanoue—DPP Director
- Angie R. Westfall—SHPD Architectural Branch Chief
- Kiersten Faulkner—HHF Executive Director
- Mahealani Cypher—Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs
- Dana Yee—ASLA

Next HPC meeting will be on September 12, 2011.

PA also requires the City to monitor the proposed demolition of resources built before 1969 within APE and within 2,000-foot radius of each station. A baseline was established at an average of 24 demolitions per year. The City will continue to monitor demolition permits within the study area and continue to work with the Department of Planning & Permitting (DPP) on the number of permits.

X. Construction Protection Plan

A construction mitigation plan (CMP) is under development. It will include a Noise and Vibration Mitigation Plan. The City will complete the CMP and will provide to contractors prior to construction, as well as provide a copy of the plan at the October 2011 PA quarterly meeting.

The City is developing a historical and cultural awareness training program and will complete the program and training sessions with contractors prior to construction. The City will also circulate all training materials to the consulting parties.

XI. Post-Review Discoveries

No unanticipated discoveries have been made along the corridor.

XII. Public Information

The semi-annual progress report will be posted on the project website. The historic property database is currently being developed.

XIII. Administrative Provisions

The City will hold a third quarterly meeting with consulting parties in October 2011 to discuss ongoing implementation of the PA. A second semi-annual report will be prepared in January 2012.

It was indicated that there are other parties interested in attending these meetings but find it difficult as they are normally held during the work week. Hinaleimoana recommends that this be considered when scheduling future meetings so that there is more participation, all sides have a chance to share and decisions can be more informed, which would help alleviate the sentiments of opposition. The City will consider these suggestions and concerns when scheduling future meetings; avoiding Wednesdays, targeting Tuesdays and Thursdays, with the possibility of an occasional meeting at night or on a weekend. Avoid the week of October 17, 2011, which is National Trust Conference.

*** Meeting adjourned at 12:30pm ***

Attending Signatories and Consulting Parties

Blythe Semmer, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Dave Cushman, SRI Foundation
Elaine Jackson-Retondo, National Park Service
Ellyn Goldkind, NAVFAC HI, Navy Region Hawaii
Hinaleimoana Falemei, O'ahu Island Burial Council
Kanaloa Koko, Royal Order of Kamehameha
Kiersten Faulkner, Historic Hawaii Foundation
Kim Evans, Kauwahi Planning
Martha Graham, SRI Foundation
Matt McDermott, Cultural Surveys
Ted Matley, Federal Transit Administration
Wendy Wichman, National Park Service

Attending Project Staff

Barbara Gilliland
Denise McGeen
Faith Miyamoto
Joanna Morsicato
Josh Silva
Judy Aranda
Kaleo Patterson
Kelsey Britt
Mark Garrity
Martha Graham
Matt McDaniel
Nālani Dahl
Stephanie Foell

Appendix B

Stipulation V, Recordation and Documentation

Dear Consulting Parties,

As part of the City and County of Honolulu's commitment to fulfill Stipulation V.B of the Programmatic Agreement, the City has reviewed and investigated the list of properties for potential cultural landscape report documentation suggested during our meeting of April 7, 2011. The list of properties included:

- Hono'uli'uli – Japanese Internment Camp
- 'Iolani Palace/Hawai'i Capital Historic District
- Mother Waldron Park
- Natatorium
- Thomas Square
- Banana Patch
- Ma'o Farms
- Makalapa
- Mo'ili'ili four story walk-ups
- Fishpond at Pearl Harbor (research pre-1883 at Pearl Harbor)
- Watercress Farms
- Dole Pineapple
- Kaumakapili Church
- (former) Pakakau Heiau (Queen Street became Ft. Armstrong later on)
- Waipahu area plantation town
- Petroglyph Field
- Leeward Community College Cemetery
- Blaisdell Park (where iwi washed up after tsunami)
- Moanalua Gardens
- Puowaina/Punchbowl
- Pu'u Kapolei (now archery range)
- Liliha Healing Springs
- Nu'uuanu 'Auwai System

As discussed at the meeting, one of the most critical components of a cultural landscape report is a willing recipient and the ability to implement recommendations included in a site treatment plan. A key consideration was identifying sites that will benefit from the cultural landscape report's treatment plan. In addition, sites that continue to convey their historic significance and retain character-defining features were also given priority.

After reviewing the list, researching prior documentation efforts, and identifying property owners and initiating discussions with select owners/overseers, the City analyzed the list of sites. First, the City determined that some sites were either already adequately documented or were in the process of undergoing documentation/assessment in the near future. In other instances, property owners were not receptive to the idea of their properties being studied or multiple property owners increased the complexity of accessing sites and executing field studies. Lastly, some properties simply lacked identified stewards or advocates willing or able to implement the cultural landscape report recommendations/treatment plans.

After careful investigation and consideration, the City proposes to document Mother Waldron Park and Irwin Park in separate cultural landscape reports. Both parks are adversely affected by the project and would be eligible for the park improvement funds identified as part of the Programmatic Agreement in

Stipulation VIII.D. The City believes that completing accurate and detailed cultural landscape reports for these parks is an important first step in informing the park improvement plan and executing historically sensitive improvements to these parks. The City also believes that the original design and military history of Irwin Park require additional investigation, as do the Art Deco design sensibility and Native Hawaiian history of Mother Waldron Park and its vicinity.

Because both parks are government owned, the potential for executing meaningful park preservation, restoration and/or potential interpretation is high with these parks. Meetings are currently being scheduled to discuss the cultural landscape reports with staff responsible for overseeing these parks.

The City is pleased to consider the proposed cultural landscape report sites that are in the project vicinity for inclusion in the historic context study. To demonstrate this commitment, the City is currently executing research on the Nuʻuanu ʻauwai system. This topic will be the subject of the sample historic context study text to be circulated to the consulting parties for comment to demonstrate the proposed level of detail and report style.

We appreciate your ongoing commitment to the project. We value your feedback on this proposal to complete cultural landscape reports for Mother Waldron Park and Irwin Park. As part of the Section 106 consultation process, please email any comments to me at fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov or you can call me at 768-8350.

Sincerely,

Faith Miyamoto

Nu'uaniu Valley 'Auwai

The verdant and picturesque Nu'uaniu Valley, situated in O'ahu's Kona *moku* in the Honolulu *ahupua'a*, encompasses downtown Honolulu and extends mauka into the Ko'olau Mountains. The valley's fresh water systems, including the Nu'uaniu, Pahoa, and Waoloni streams, made it an ideal environment for ancient Hawaiian settlement and agricultural production, allowing for easy transportation between the Ko'olau Mountains' leeward and windward sides. Today, the Nu'uaniu Valley's lower and central portions that extend mauka from Honolulu Harbor contain densely populated urban and suburban neighborhoods; the valley's upper portion extends through the Honolulu Watershed Forest Reserve.

Although the lower Nu'uaniu Valley's environment is predominately urban today, less than 150 years ago, lush and fertile cultivated fields occupied much of the valley. The upper valley's abundant rainfall and the extensive network of fresh water streams and pools created an environment well-suited for agricultural production. Early explorers' accounts and oral histories transcribed in the early nineteenth century describe expansive fields of terraced taro patches, called *lo'i*, fed by an intricate network of irrigation ditches (*'auwai*) that also influenced the *ahupua'a* residents' communal lifestyle.

Upon encountering an *'auwai* system on Kaua'i, explorer Nathaniel Portlock was duly impressed by the engineering feat executed by the island's residents.

This excursion gave me a fresh opportunity of admiring the amazing ingenuity and industry of the natives in laying out the taro and sugar-cane grounds; the greatest part of which are made up on the banks of the river, with exceeding good causeways made with stones and earth, leading up the valleys to each plantation; the taro beds are in general a quarter of a mile over, dammed in, and they have a place on one part of the bank, that serves as a gateway. When the rains commence, which is in the winter season, the river swells with the torrents from the mountains, and overflowed their taro-beds; and when the rains are over, and the rivers decrease, the dams are stopped up, and the water kept in to nourish the taro and sugar-cane during the dry season; the water in the beds is generally about one foot and a half, or two feet, over a muddy bottom . . . the taro also grows frequently as large as a man's head.

King Kamehameha I conquered O'ahu in 1795 and established the seat of the Hawaiian monarchy in Honolulu in 1810. The growing city's population necessitated greater agricultural infrastructure development, especially for taro cultivation. The king, or *Mō'i*, retained land in Nu'uaniu for himself and established huge (extensive?) farms in the valley to support the government. By the late nineteenth century, after the *Mahele* abolished the feudal tenure system, Honolulu residents continued to rely on the valley for their primary supply of food and fresh water. Although taro was the valley's principal crop, banana, sugarcane, sweet potato, rice, and other staples were planted along *lo'i* embankments. Confirming Nu'uaniu Valley's agricultural significance, one popular chant, as translated by Hawaiian scholar, Mary Kawena Pukui, reads: *Ho'ake ahi, ko'ala ke ola. O na hale wale no ka i Honolulu; oka 'ai a meka i'a i Nu'uaniu. Light the fire for there is life-giving substance. Only the houses stand in Honolulu; the vegetable food and meat are in Nu'uaniu.*

Ethnobotanists trace taro cultivation in Hawai'i to Polynesian settlers who brought the plant with them to the islands. More than just a staple of the Hawaiian diet, the taro (*kalo*) plant's cultivation and consumption permeates Hawaiian mythology, religion, and customs. According to Hawaiian legend, mankind and the taro plant are brothers. The elder taro plant and the younger mankind were both born to

Wakea (Sky Father) and his daughter Ho'oku ka Iani. As the younger sibling, mankind honored and cared for its elder sibling. In return, the elder taro fed and nurtured its younger sibling. Taro is associated with this and other ancient myths and traditions connecting the plant to the concept of family itself. Even the Hawaiian language is influenced by these familial concepts. Taro reproduces via stems that sprout from the corm, the starchy, edible root growing underground. These stems are called *'oha*, the root word for *'ohana*, or family.

Honolulu's development and expansion and the Hawaiian society's transformed political and economic structure between the mid-nineteenth century and the early twentieth century drastically changed the Nu'uau Valley's landscape. By the mid-twentieth century, tracts of single-family houses replaced the lush *lo'i* and farmsteads, and reservoirs and underground pipes reconfigured the natural flow of the valley's streams. Since that time, the Nu'uau Valley's *'auwai* have suffered from neglect or destruction, due in large part to a lack of understanding about their historic significance.

The *'auwai* primarily existed to support taro cultivation. Taro can be cultivated by two very different methods. Upland, or dryland, taro is planted in non-flooded areas that are fed by rainfall. Lowland, or wetland, taro is grown in water-saturated fields. While wetland taro can be grown in marshy areas, along stream beds, and around springs, the preferred and more efficient cultivation method is in *lo'i* irrigated by *'auwai*. The *'auwai* construction and maintenance formed foundations around which an entire economy, class system, and culture functioned. E.S. Craighill Handy, an early-twentieth-century anthropologist, postulates that the *'auwai*, *lo'i*, and the taro plant's mythical and spiritual connections in Hawaiian society influenced individual and social activity within the *ahupua'a*. Taro cultivation affected many aspects of Hawaiian life: the labor required to build and maintain the *'auwai*; the shared water rights; and tributes to the *Mō'i* and to the chiefs (*Ali'i*).

In Hawaiian society prior to the *Mahele*, the *Mō'i* had the sole authority to order *'auwai* construction. Such an undertaking typically amounted to a public works project in which every capable hand in the community participated. The local supervisor of lands (*konohiki*) levied workers from the *'ili* through which the *'auwai* passed and oversaw the construction effort. The *konohiki* overseeing maintenance of the completed system became the water chief (*luna wai*). The farmers (*hoa'āina*), contributed labor to their respective *konohiki* based on the amount of water needed. Under the Hawaiian water rights system, a planter's construction labor contribution determined the amount of water allotted. Thus, water access for taro was not necessarily proportional to the acreage planted. The farmer of a large *lo'i* would earn a smaller share of water rights than a small *lo'i* if he contributed less labor.

'Auwai varied in size and structure depending on the number and size of *lo'i* they irrigated. In smaller *lo'i*, water could be directed from one terrace into the next below it. However, larger *lo'i* required individual *'auwai* capable of carrying more water. In more complex systems, these might be branches from another *'auwai*, often connected to the same source. Workers dug the ditches from the lower end upward to the water source, passing alongside *lo'i* or branching off into smaller, distinct *'auwai*. Openings in the embankments blocked by rocks or clods of earth allowed the *hoa'āina* to admit water into the terrace at designated times. Upon reaching the water source, work halted in preparation for a ritual celebration during which a modest dam (*mano*) was constructed.

In 1894, Emma Nakuina, an expert on Hawaiian water rights, described the *mano* consecration ceremony as one for rejoicing and feasting. The local priest of Lono (the god of agriculture, fertility, rainfall, and music) chose the appropriate day, and the *konohiki* supplied food for the workers. A hog and other food items were then baked in an underground oven (*imu*) near the *mano* site.

When everything was cooked and in readiness, the *kahuna* took the head of the hog, the fishes and the bowl of 'awa juice, and going to the place where the dam was to be built made an offering of these to the water *akua* or god...Everything edible at this feast of consecration had to be consumed either by the people or by their dogs. All the refuse was buried in the *imu*; the dam built in a few minutes, and the water turned into the new 'auwai, flowing directly over the now submerged *imu*.

In the *ahupua'a*, water rights were valued over land rights. In fact, Hawaiians equated access to water (*wai*) with wealth, property, or ownership (*waiwai*). The Hawaiian word for law, "*kanawai*," comes directly from water rights governance in the *ahupua'a*. Under this concept, the *luna wai* regulated 'auwai use. The *luna wai* established a schedule where by *hoa'aina* were allowed access at different times of the day or week. Failure by any farmer to maintain his portion of the 'auwai; to take water at the correct time; or to produce enough taro to pay his tribute resulted in a loss of his water rights. The responsibilities of the *luna wai* also included monitoring the *mano* at the source of the 'auwai. No more than half of the natural flow could be diverted, ensuring that the rights of those living and farming downstream were protected. This law was taken seriously: according to Nakuina, anyone caught tampering with or breaking the *mano* was subject to death and his or her body was used to block the offending break created.

Each *hoa'aina* constructed his own *lo'i* with help from family members or the community. The farmer first flooded the designated plot of land to soften the soil. After the soil was sufficiently loosened, workers lined up inside the plot and used an *o'o* (digging stick) to dig down to the subsoil. They then flung the loose soil around the perimeter to create embankments, firming them by pounding sugarcane leaves into the surface and layering them with coconut fronds, wet soil, and mulch. Farmers with *lo'i* located on steeper slopes often reinforced their plots with stone retaining walls. After constructing the embankments, the community or family members gathered for a day of treading. During this festive event, the *lo'i* were flooded with water, then men, women and children waded in and pounded down the mud by dancing, jumping, and stomping vigorously. Afterwards, participants enjoyed a celebratory feast. The following day, the *hoa'aina* planted taro in the firm mud of the *lo'i* and immersed the plants in water until harvesting.

After King Kamehameha I conquered the island of O'ahu and, in 1810, formally established the Kingdom of Hawai'i, he initiated a campaign to promote food production throughout the islands. Kamehameha's plan included cultivating his own land in Nu'uuanu Valley and constructing an extensive system of 'auwai in the valley. According to nineteenth-century historian, John Papa 'I'i, Kamehameha's farmhouses in Nu'uuanu "stood several hundred fathoms away from the right side of Nu'uuanu Street and Hanai a ka malama House [now the Queen Emma Summer Palace]. Perhaps this location was chosen to enable him to look both inland and seaward to his food patches." The king worked his own lands along with the commoners (*maka'ainana*), and as a result earned respect and admiration as a hard-working *Mō'i*.

The royal family continued to expand and improve upon the Nu'uuanu Valley's 'auwai in the valley after Kamehameha I's death in 1819. Nearly thirty years later, in 1850, Chief Kuho'oheihēpahu (Abner) Pākī constructed the last 'auwai in Nu'uuanu Valley. Judge Antonio Perry, in his 1912 history of Hawaiian water rights, explains that 700 men constructed the 'auwai in a mere three days. The completed Pākī 'Auwai, as it was named, extended from above Luakaha, near the upper end of Nu'uuanu Pali Drive, to below Wyllie Street near the O'ahu Cemetery. Joseph S. Emerson surveyed Nu'uuanu Valley in 1877. His detailed map of the Pākī 'Auwai, dated 1884, indicates that watercourse alone supported more than 100 *lo'i* at the time. Both private and government owners shared the 'auwai and adhered to a schedule carefully described by Emerson, even after the *Mahele* ended the land tenure system and resource sharing in the *ahupua'a*.

Late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century development in the valley led to a shift in land use resulting in a decline in taro production. As the island's population grew, so too did the housing density within Nu'uauu Valley. Reservoirs built as early as the 1860s diverted water from the streams for use in Honolulu, forever changing the region's relationship to its water sources. By the mid-twentieth century, little agriculture remained in the valley. Instead the 'auwai traversed through or flowed under newly built suburban yards. Many 'auwai were destroyed or diverted underground, while others were neglected to the point of total deterioration, often because homeowners did not understand their purpose or significance. What remains is a disjointed system of ditches and underground drains. Today, evidence of fourteen original 'auwai, and numerous smaller branches, have been identified in connection with the Nu'uauu, Pahoā, and Waoloni streams in the valley. Of those, eight still carry water or retain enough physical integrity to be rehabilitated. Recently, several preservation groups have focused attention on the condition of the 'auwai, increasing local awareness to their unique and significant history.

Key Sources

Handy, E.S.Craighill. *The Hawaiian Planter, Vol. I*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Bulletin no. 161, 1940.

Handy, E.S. Craighill and Elizabeth Green Handy. *Native Planters in Old Hawai'i: their life, lore, and environment*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1991.

'Ii, John Papa. *Fragments of Hawaiian History*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1959.

Kamakau, Samuel, M. *Tales and Traditions of the People of Old: Na Mo'Olelo a Ka Po'e Kahiko*. Translated by Mary Kawena Pukui. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1993.

Kame'eleihiwa, Lilikalā. *Native Land and Foreign Desires, Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992.

Kim & Shiroma Engineers, Inc. *Miscellaneous Storm Drain Improvements, 'Auwai in Nu'uauu Valley*. Prepared for Community Vision District Group No. 12 Nu'uauu/Alewa and Department of Design and Construction City and County of Honolulu, 2003.

Krauss, Beatrice, H. *Plants in Hawaiian Culture*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1993.

Lalakea, Thomas K., "The 'Auwai of Nu'uauu Valley," *Historic Hawai'i*, May 1990.

Nakuina, Emma M. "Ancient Hawaiian Water Rights." *Hawaiian Almanac and Annual* (1894): 79-84.

Perry, Judge Antonio. *A brief History of Hawaiian Water Rights*. Speech Read at the Annual Dinner of the Hawaiian Bar Association, June 15, 1912.

Portlock, Nathaniel (Captain). *A Voyage Round the World But More Particularly to the North-West Coast of America*. London: John Stockdale and George Goulding, 1789. Pukui, Mary Kawena. *Olelo No'eau; Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1983.

Wadsworth, H.A. *A Historical Summary of Irrigation in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 1933. Originally published in *The Hawaiian Planters' Record*, Vol. 37, No. 3. Honolulu: The Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, 1933.

Wilcox, Carol. *Sugar Water*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996.

Appendix C

Major Milestones

Programmatic Agreement Major Milestones

as of March 16, 2011

PA Stipulations	Start Date	End Date	Notes
I. Roles and Responsibilities	1/18/2011	1/18/2011	
Kako'o hired by City	1/18/2011	7/18/2011	within 6 mos position funded
II. Traditional Cultural Properties	1/18/2011	3/19/2011	
City Center (Chinatown)	2/28/2013	8/28/2013	Study initiated within 30 days. Meeting held on 2/12/11 ; Chinatown TCP fieldwork/determinations prior to construction
III. Archaeological Sites and Burials	1/18/2011	12/1/2012	
Site Protocol for OIBC	1/18/2011	7/17/2011	within 180 days
Kamehameha AIS Plan	Complete		
Kamehameha AIS Fieldwork	1/25/2011	4/30/2011	
Airport AIS Plan	5/18/2011	10/1/2011	Durations include plan prep, reviews and approval
Airport AIS Fieldwork	10/1/2011	10/21/2012	
City Center AIS Plan	1/18/2011	8/31/2011	Durations include plan prep, reviews and approval. Consultation meeting scheduled 3/16/11
City Center AIS Fieldwork	8/31/2011	5/26/2013	Required prior to beginning Final Design
IV. Design Review	3/1/2011	4/20/2015	
Station Workshops (2 per each station group)	5/18/2011	12/14/2014	Consideration while completing design (see attached draft workshop schedule)
Preliminary Design Plan Review	3/1/2011	4/30/2011	Plans distributed 2/25/11
Station Final Design Plans	11/30/2013	4/20/2015	Only affects Airport and City Center Stations
V. Recordation and Documentation	1/18/2011	8/28/2013	Context Studies/CLR's
Historic Context and CLR draft scope	1/18/2011	4/18/2011	Kickoff w/in 60 days. Consultation held 3/2/2011
Photography and video	4/18/2011	8/28/2013	
VI. National Register of Historic Places	11/25/2010	5/21/2019	Requirements TBD - requires coordination with SHPD and NPS
Final Nomination Forms Makalapa and Little Makalapa	TBD	TBD	
Final Nomination Forms for All	12/1/2014	12/1/2015	
VII. Education and Interpretive Programs	5/1/2011	5/21/2012	
Planning Kickoff	5/1/2011	5/10/2011	
Complete Interpretive Plan	5/10/2011	9/1/2011	
Humanities Program	6/1/2015	12/1/2015	
VIII. Mitigation for Specific Property	4/7/2014	5/7/2015	
Park Improvement Plan	4/7/2014	5/7/2015	Complete prior to construction completion
Park Improvement Fund	10/1/2013	12/1/2013	Link with City budgeting process
IX. Measures to Address Effects	1/18/2011	6/14/2013	
Historic Preservation Committee Creation	1/18/2011	4/18/2011	Within 90 days establish, SHPD Approval and schedule first meeting
Demolition Monitoring Baseline Report	1/18/2011	7/17/2011	Within 180 days establish baseline for monitoring
X. Construction Protection Plan	9/1/2011	11/1/2017	No date stipulated, must be updated every 6 months
XI. City Contractors	2/23/2011	3/1/2019	
Historical/Cultural Awareness Training	2/23/2011	3/1/2019	Annual Training of construction contractors and employees
XII. Post Review Discoveries	N/A	N/A	Not applicable at this time
XIII. Public Information	1/18/2011	3/1/2019	
Summary Report (semi-annually)	1/18/2011	3/1/2019	Every 6 months Progress Report
XIV. Administrative	1/18/2011	7/18/2020	
PA Schedule	1/18/2011	3/19/2011	60 days provide schedule for review (see attached draft schedule)
Quarterly Meetings	1/18/2011	1/28/2013	Quarterly meetings for the first 24 months, 1st quarterly meeting schedule for 4/14/2011
Annual Meetings	1/28/2014	3/1/2019	Annual meetings after the first two years

DRAFT Schedule for Station Design Workshops for PA Consulting Parties (UPDATED)

Design Package	Stations	Workshop #1			Workshop #2		
		Date	Attendees	Purpose	Date	Attendees	Purpose
Farrington Station Group	West Loch, Waipahu TC, Leeward CC	3/30/2011 @ 10:00 AM	Consulting parties	To present existing 30% designs	September, 2011	Consulting Parties & Public	To present updated designs
West Oahu Station Group	East Kapolei, UH West Oahu, Ho'opili	6/22/2011 @ 10:00 AM	Consulting parties	To present existing 30% designs	January, 2012	Consulting Parties & Public	To present updated designs
Kamehameha Station Group (A)	Pearl Highlands, Pearlridge	9/21/2011 @ 10:00 AM	Consulting parties	To present existing 30% designs	March, 2012	Consulting Parties & Public	To present updated designs
Kamehameha Station Group (B)	Aloha Stadium	October, 2011	Consulting Parties & Public	To garner public ideas	April, 2012	Consulting Parties & Public	To present draft designs
Airport Station Group	Pearl Harbor Navy Base	November, 2011	Consulting Parties & Other Stakeholders	Design Workshop to discuss historic context	August, 2013	Consulting Parties & Public	To present draft designs
Airport Station Group	Airport, Lagoon Drive	March, 2013	Consulting Parties & Public	To garner public ideas	August, 2013	Consulting Parties & Public	To present draft designs
Dillingham Station Group	Middle Street, Kalihi, Kapalama	September, 2013	Consulting Parties & Public	To garner public ideas	January, 2014	Consulting Parties & Public	To present draft designs
City Center Station Group	Iwilei	November, 2013	Consulting Parties & Public	To garner public ideas	April, 2014	Consulting Parties & Public	To present draft designs
City Center Station Group	Chinatown	January, 2012	Consulting Parties & Other Stakeholders	Design Workshop to discuss historic context	April, 2014	Consulting Parties & Public	To present draft designs
City Center Station Group	Downtown	March, 2012	Consulting Parties & Other Stakeholders	Design Workshop to discuss historic context	April, 2014	Consulting Parties & Public	To present draft designs
Kaka'ako Station Group	Civic Center, Kaka'ako, Ala Moana	September, 2014	Consulting Parties & Public	To garner public ideas	January, 2015	Consulting Parties & Public	To present draft designs