Appendix H: SHPD Review Letter, CSH E-mail Response, Meeting Minutes, and AISP Approval Letter

NEIL ABERCROMBIE
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII

WILLIAM J. AILA, JR.
INTERIM CHAIRPERSON
BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

GUY H. KAULUKUKUI
ACTING FIRST DEPUTY

WILLIAM M. TAM
ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR - WATER

AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND OCEAN RECREATION
BUREAU OF CONVEYANCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
CONSERVATION AND COASTAL LANDS
CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT
ENGINEERING
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
KAHOOLAWE ISLAND RESERVE COMMISSION
LAND
STATE PARKS

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

POST OFFICE BOX 621
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809

August 3, 2011

Hallett H. Hammatt, Ph.D
P.O. Box 1114
Kailua, Hawaii 96734

LOG NO: 2011.1435
DOC NO: 1107NN05

Dear Dr. Hammatt:

SUBJECT: National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 Review – (DRAFT) Archaeological Inventory Survey Plan for City Center PHASE 4 of the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project Kalihi, Kapālama, and Honolulu Ahupua‘a, Honolulu District, Island of O‘ahu TMK: (3) 7-4-021: 002

Thank you for requesting our review of this draft Archeological Inventory Survey Plan (AISP) titled *Archaeological Inventory Survey Plan for the City Center (Construction Phase 4) of the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project, Kaliki, Kapālama, and Honolulu Ahupua`a, Honolulu Disctrict, Island of O‘ahu TMK: [1] 1-2, 1-5, 1-7, 2-1, 2-3 (Various Plats and Parcels) Volume I: Plan and Appendices F and G* and *Volume II: Appendices A-E, Land Documents by* Hammatt, et.al (CSH report code KALIHI 17) that was received by our office on May 18, 2011. This AISP was prepared in compliance with National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Review.

The AISP explains the intent to identify and record any remaining historic sites and cultural deposits located within the 13.87 acre project corridor that extends east along the southern coast of Ohau from Kalihi Stream on Dillingham Boulevard to Ala Moana Center on Kona Street. Project construction will require relocation of existing utility lines within the project corridor that conflict with the proposed Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project. Amongst other land disturbing activities including grading of facility locations, and excavations for the guideway column foundations, relocating utilities will cause the most disturbances.

While this plan is a good start, the issues in the attached pages must be addressed in order for the AISP to be accepted by this division.

Sincerely,

Pua Aiu, Ph.D
Administrator
Historic Preservation Division

ATTACHMENT

1. Pg. 9-10. We too, recognize that federal and state law define historical properties differently and your use of cultural resources as a blanket term to alleviate confusion is understandable. However, SHPD must abide by historic preservation laws set forth in 36 CFR 800.16 and HAR § 13.284-2. Please change.

2. Pg. 11-12. Please indicate survey methods planned for the clearing of transit sites, support columns and utility lines, ancillary features including maintenance, storage and traction power substations. For the demolition of adjacent buildings mentioned on page 12, what will be the subsurface impacts of demolition? For example, will there be massive grading or the removal of material by scooping up of soils with heavy equipment? If so, please be clear how survey methods will be done in these areas too. Lastly, please specify survey methods for the road widening portion.

Background Review

3. The background review was limited in presentation. We would suggest that you look beyond standard research documentation to Captains journals, merchant journals and old newspapers, all of which may provide more specifics of where sites were. The Mahele land information needs to be more detailed – location of specific houses, lo`i and dryland fields in parcels so distributional area might be revealed. The general pattern of the transect however is clear enough for pre-European and early 1800s times.

Predictions of Site Patterns

4. Predictions of site patterns should be strengthened. Background information should allow for more specific predictions. We would like to see materials pulled together with clearer predictions of pre-European and post-European times. One striking example: in several places, you mention and show on maps that the Iwilei to Kakaako section (to Punchbowl) was in the sea (in the harbor). However, on pg. 23 last line and Fig. 32 on pg. 66, it wasn't clear if it was under the sea or not. If it was, then no pre-European or early 1800 historic properties are expected in this area. We would anticipate later 1800s-1900s deposits and this should be specified (when and what type of historic properties were once in the area.)

5. In the Kalihi to Kapalama area, the prediction on pg. 136 says that the study area could "include both pre-and post-contact subsurface cultural deposits, including human burials, artifact and midden deposits, trashpits, privies, buried structural foundations, fishpond sediments and agricultural sediments." This seems too general. Do you expect irrigated kalo fields with archeological remnants of soils and walls? Do you expect dryland agricultural fields and with what archeological signature? Do you expect permanent habitations with associated artifacts, food remains or midden, trash pits, cooking ovens, privies in the 1800s and/or structural foundations? The Mahele documents permanent habitations. Do you expect other types of habitations, such as field shelters? Do you expect burials associated with the house yards or with something else? Do you expect fishponds through the entire corridor of Kalihi to Kapalama or in another specific location? Please clarify what the properties might have been – irrigated kalo fields, dryland fields, permanent houseyards with associated burials, fishponds-in terms of function and not in terms of archeological traits such as deposits or individual archeological features. This is vital for the identification of significance of a historic property.

6. Predictions should also include what historic properties from the 1800s to 1900s might be present. For example, if Kalihi and Kapalama were an early 1900s suburb of Honolulu, would different patterns be present?

7. On pg. 145, you point out that in archeological inventory surveys, the aim is first to find what is out there and only then can one truly develop reasonable research questions. This is reasonable. The emphasis of the survey then should be to find the historic properties and evaluate their significance. To do so, one must

describe the finds at the property, determine the size of the historic property (as best as possible), determine the function of the property, and attempt to determine its age. This should be the focus of this survey. We expect in the conclusion of the survey report an analysis of more general patterns that can lead to research questions.

8. When looking at site patterns across the coastal settlement transect to see if there are distributional patterns (irrigated kalo only near streams, dryland fields and houses back from streams perhaps) please also consider the serious sampling problems of such a transect. First, the sample is far from representative, as only spots along the transect will be sampled. Similarly, looking at distributional patterns of burials by time periods – again, sampling issues must be addressed.

9. Properties of pre-European times – does it fit the models for settlement of Oahu (pre AD 1000)? Does it fit models of abandonment of traditional houseyards?

Field Methods

10. Excavation by backhoe of 3-6 meter or roughly 10-20 foot trenches seems to be the only excavation technique mentioned in the key methods part of the report (ca. pg. 159). This is okay to find what is there, but it destroys much of the context. The plan says an archeological monitor will watch and if excavation reaches the natural sand layer, then they will dig by hand. Usually an archeological monitor watches part of the intact deposits being destroyed, before the backhoe can be stopped. In downtown Honolulu, much of the fill is actually cultural deposits – significant mid 1800s to early 1900s deposits. Is it your intent to cut right down this layer with a backhoe? We feel that excavation of backhoe should be down until cultural deposits of at least late 1800s are encountered and then excavation by hand. This was required for downtown field work by S. Lebo at the old Iron works. Please offer some ideas on a better approach.

11. Typically when checking by backhoe – when a historic property is found (pre-European to early 1900s) then hand excavations are expanded from the backhoe trench to clarify the size and nature of the historic property. . Please clarify what will happen should the backhoe encounter a historic property. If we have misread the methodology, please clarify page 159.

12. Please clarify what field methods will be used for the ancillary areas.

13. In a project of this importance, proven techniques should be used. Such a survey has no place for experimentation with new methods that are far from proven. GPR has been tested a couple of times in the islands and had limited results (rocks appeared like burials). Cadaver dogs and GPR should not be attempted on such a survey unless you are using these methods to evaluate their effectiveness in conjunction with proven methods.

Lab Methods

14. Most of the lab methods are standard, except some of it is research focused when earlier in the report it mentions that there are no known research questions yet. For example, why do you need bulk sediment sample analysis at this point, or pollen or EDXRF? These analyses should be better justified. If their findings indicate that some of these are relevant for research questions related to these historic properties, then these analyses could be done as part of the data recovery. If you would like to do them now, it needs to be clear why.

15. Dating is vital. Radiocarbon dating is basically all there is for pre-European times, unless branch coral is discovered and refined dating of coral can be done. Also clearly early 1800s-1900s historic properties are likely to be present throughout the corridor, so dating of historic artifacts, including bottles, ceramics, nails, etc. must be included to ensure an attempt to date such properties or portions of the properties.

Matt McDermott

To: Deona.Naboa@hawaii.gov; Pua.Aiu@hawaii.gov

1. Need clarity on how the word choice in the draft AISP is not in keeping with 36 CFR 800.16 or HAR 13-275-2. The use of the term cultural resource or archaeological cultural resource to avoid confusion in these situations where there are two slightly different historic preservation regulatory frameworks is accepted SOP. It is unclear what SHPD would like changed.

2. I can see how the uncertainty in this general project description text taken from the project's EIS raises some confusion. The uncertainty will be taken out—updated to reflect current the current project scope and footprint. Regarding survey methods---project engineers have added up all areas of direct ground disturbance—which by the project's PA is the definition of the project's APE for archaeological resources—as 13.87 acres. This entire 13.87 acre area will be surveyed by pedestrian inspection. We are not expecting surface archaeological deposits. The focus of survey will be the subsurface testing sampling strategy.

3. Need to discuss duplication of effort in background research between Kumu Pono's (Mr. Kepa Maly—hired by the project for ethnographic and ethnohistoric research) project-related TCP and cultural landscape studies and the AIS background research. CSH feels the background information is largely there in the current draft AISP, but could be refocused more specifically into the settlement pattern framework described in 13-276 -5(b). Background section includes accounts from early sea captains and merchants, missionaries, and settlers, as well as historic almanacs and periodicals. Additional settlement pattern discussion will be added to provide framework for cultural resource interpretation and significance. The project has made commitments to OIBC, and other Native Hawaiian consulting parties that the AISP background research is not "it" for the City Center—the project work of Kumu Pono, and additional CSH background research will be required for AIS report to properly interpret and make significance and effect recommendations on the archaeological cultural resources that are found.

4, 5, and 6. I understand SHPD's request for more specific predictions of potential site locations/site patterns. CSH seeks balance between this more labor intensive research and its utility in actually guiding the sampling strategy. In this particular instance, more detailed predictions will not change the need to sample nearly the entire length of the corridor—even presumed off-shore areas will need some verification due to the uncertainties of overlaying historic maps on modern maps. Summary figures might be the best means of addressing your concerns.

7. We agree regarding the research questions. We agree on the focus of AIS investigations—stated in the draft AISP on page 145 and the bottom of page 9. The AIS report will provide information to support the development of specific research questions.

8 and 9. There are limitations to any sampling strategy, let's talk about your specific concerns.

10.

11. The survey area for the AIS is confined to the project APE—defined in the project PA as the area of direct project ground disturbance. The AIS investigation is limited to that area. Discussions with Native Hawaiian individuals and groups have made it clear that sediments that would not be otherwise disturbed by the project, should not be disturbed by the AIS investigation. Please refer to page 271 for the detailed discussion of what happens when a potential historic property is found.

12. Ancillary areas will be subject to the same survey methods described for the rest of the survey area—pedestrian inspection and sampling with backhoe trenches.

1

13. GPR use specifically required in project's PA and requested by the overwhelming majority of Native Hawaiian cultural consultants. The focus with the GPR is to use the AIS to evaluate the GPR effectiveness, at least, and potentially improve that effectiveness through "ground truthing" process. Page 157 clearly states that the HHRD dogs are not a component of this AIS research design.

14. The AIS clearly must identify and characterize the archaeological resources found. Detailed sample analysis, including the results from processing bulk sediment samples and pollen analysis are well established AIS lab methods to do this—for example, identifying buried former agricultural deposits and wet land deposits with important paleoenvironmental information. EDXRF is less well established, but provides great results on lithic sourcing, is non-destructive and cheap. The information it provides helps characterize archaeological deposits and can help develop research questions.

15. We agree radiocarbon dating will be important for the AIS—this dating is described on page 162. As described on page 161, historic artifacts will be identified using available references. The discussion will be expanded to state that identified historic artifacts will be used to characterize the age, function, and potentially cultural affiliation of associated deposits.

Matt McDermott, MA
Projects Manager
Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc.
P.O. Box 1114, Kailua, HI 96734
Office (808) 262-9972
Cell (808) 754-8852
mmcdermott@culturalsurveys.com

2

Meeting Notes

HHCTCP City Center, AISP meeting with SHPD

1:00 pm, Friday, August 12, 2011, at Kapolei SHPD office library

Attendees:

SHPD: Nona Naboa, Pua Aiu

PB: Barbara Gilliland

CSH: Hal Hammatt, Matt McDermott, Ena Sroat

Agenda: SHPD August 3rd. 2011 review letter of the draft HHCTCP City Center AISP

Notes:

It was determined at the outset of the meeting that the best approach to resolve issues and concerns raised by SHPD in its review letter for the AISP (HHCTCP City Center) would be to follow the numerical order within the review letter (refer to the attached letter: LOG NO: 2011.1435; DOC NO: 1107NN05) and within the CSH response email which addressed SHPD's concerns (refer to attached email letter). The discussion is presented below in this format.

1. Regarding the use of the terms "historic properties" and "cultural resources":
   Ms. Naboa stated that the term "historic properties" is clearly specified in Hawaii state laws and that its use, rather than "cultural properties", would make it easier for review. It was agreed that the AISP would retain the use of the term "cultural resources" with the addition of some clarifying language and that the AIS report would use the term "historic properties".

2. Regarding the project description and the survey methods proposed to address ground-disturbing impacts:
   Mr. McDermott explained that the project description had been copied from the project's EIS and thus was somewhat outdated and causing confusion. It was agreed that the project description would be updated to reflect the current project scope and footprint. It was agreed that CSH's response email adequately addressed SHPD's concerns (i.e. CSH explained that it would conduct a pedestrian survey of the entire APE of the project, but that the focus of the survey would be the subsurface testing sampling strategy).

3. Regarding the AISP background review:
   Mr. McDermott described the detailed Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) study that is currently being conducted by the cultural research company Kumu Pono for the project. The information derived during this TCP will help to interpret AIS findings and be incorporated into the AIS report. It was explained that Kumu Pono is currently conducting research for Phases 1 & 2, but that Phase 4 would be available in spring of 2012 and be included in the report.
   Ms. Aiu stated that this type of information should be used to determine beforehand where to put test trenches.

1

Mr. McDermott explained that for this project CSH would need to test everywhere regardless and that therefore more background information would not affect the selection of test trench locations.

Ms. Naboa asked that the AISP include a discussion stating that the TCP information will be included in the AIS report.

Mr. McDermott agreed that the AISP would make this clearer and would include clear references in the report to the section in which this topic is discussed.

Ms. Aiu clarified that the AIS report would not need intensive detail from Kumu Pono's report but rather references as to where to find relevant information within the TCP study.

It was agreed that the AISP would include a discussion of settlement patterns of the *ahupua'a* that the project will traverse (this section will be after the background research and before the Predictive Model section).

4-6. Regarding predictions of site patterns:

These points were addressed in the above discussion. Mr. McDermott stated that the AISP will add specific figures addressing settlement patterns.

7-9. Regarding predictions of site patterns:

SHPD and CSH were in agreement with the focus of AIS investigations and the AIS report's development of research questions.

Regarding the sampling strategy in areas believed to have been located offshore during pre-contact times, Mr. McDermott explained that available information regarding the location of the pre-contact coastline is not enough to rule out certain areas and the sampling strategy will therefore test in these areas.

Dr. Hammatt explained that as a result of the consultation process CSH increased the amount of testing by 10%.

10-12. Regarding field methods and the dating of historic artifacts:

Ms. Naboa emphasized the complex history of the downtown area (Phase 4) and the need for thorough investigation.

Mr. McDermott explained the backhoe sampling methodology. He stated that historic features encountered could be hand excavated in order to address Ms. Naboa's concerns.

Mr. McDermott explained that CSH did not want to expand the investigation of historic properties into areas not proposed for ground-disturbance, and thereby increase the chance of encountering burials. Mitigation measures will first attempt to relocate rail columns to an alternate location. He then detailed the consultation process that would ensue with project engineers.

13. Regarding the use of GPR and HHRD dogs:

It was explained that the use of GPR was specifically required by the project's Programmatic Agreement (PA). Regarding the use of HHRD dogs, it was clarified that the City is still investigating the utility of this technique and the results of any HHRD program by the City will be incorporated into the AIS report; however, the use of the HHRD dogs is not part of the AISP.

Ms. Aiu clarified that the archaeological discussion within the PA is not elaborate since state laws are already in place.

2

14. Regarding lab methods and the use of bulk samples, pollen analysis and EDXRF:
Mr. McDermott explained that the collection of field samples will help inform the interpretation of the AIS results. Regarding the EDXRF, the technology is so reasonably priced ($25 per sample) and can give such informative results that its use will be very helpful in interpreting stone artifacts (their origin, possible trade links, etc.).
Ms. Naboa explained that her concern was for the interpretation of site functions and that the clarified sampling and laboratory strategy adequately addressed those concerns.

15. Regarding lab methods and dating techniques:
Mr. McDermott clarified that early 1800s-1900s historic property features would be analyzed, with general analysis taking place in the field (tallying and classification of redundant artifact types, or non diagnostic artifact types) and more detailed analysis of collected representative artifact samples, or artifacts that cannot be identified in the field, taking place in the CSH laboratory.

General Discussion:

- Regarding the AISP for Phase 3 (Airport):

Ms. Gilliland questioned whether the recently submitted Airport AISP would be subject to the same review concerns as for the AISP City Center.
Ms. Naboa responded that she follows a review format and that therefore she would express the same concerns in her review letter. Ms. Naboa stated that she was so busy that reviewing the Airport AISP as it currently stands (i.e with many of the same concerns/edits needing to be addressed as in the City Center AISP) would be an unproductive use of her time.
Discussion ensued on how to address the already submitted Airport AISP. Ms. Aiu suggested that the SHPD review letter could include a section stating that SHPD acceptance of the plan would be conditional upon the correction of the same concerns as those addressed in the AISP City Center. Documentation would also be included (the SHPD review letter for the AISP City Center, the CSH response email, and these meeting minutes).

- Regarding rail reports and plans yet to be submitted to SHPD:

Ms. Naboa asked for information on all reports and plans for the rail project that have yet to be submitted to SHPD. It was clarified that the AIS report for Phase 2 (Pearl Ridge) will be submitted within a few weeks, following completion of the last 4 test trenches in the Aloha Stadium area. In addition, a Data Recovery Plan for the Waipahu Transit Station (containing *lo'i* sediments) had already been submitted. It was agreed that Ms. Naboa would be sent a copy of the submittal form in order to assist her in tracking down the document. As discussed during this meeting, both AISPs for Phases 3 and 4 had just been submitted.

- Regarding the Phase 2 plan and the TCP study:

Ms. Aiu questioned the omission within the Phase 2 plan of the TCP research information. Ms. Naboa stated that detailed information on this area had already been gathered by the National Parks.

3

- Regarding this meeting process:
  Ms. Naboa expressed satisfaction with this meeting process and its potential use for future SHPD discussions: i.e. the review letter, followed by a written reply clearly addressing SHPD concerns. In this way it may be possible to then ultimately resolve issues and concerns via a follow-up telephone conversation rather than a face-to-face meeting, and hence save everybody time.

4

NEIL ABERCROMBIE
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

POST OFFICE BOX 621
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809

WILLIAM J. AILA, JR.
INTERIM CHAIRPERSON
BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

GUY H. KAUL.UKUKUI
ACTING FIRST DEPUTY

WILLIAM M. TAM
ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR - WATER

AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND OCEAN RECREATION
BUREAU OF CONVEYANCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
CONSERVATION AND COASTAL LANDS
CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT
ENGINEERING
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
KAHOOLAWE ISLAND RESERVE COMMISSION
LAND
STATE PARKS

October 25, 2011

Hallett H. Hammatt, Ph.D
P.O. Box 1114
Kailua, Hawaii 96734

LOG NO: 2011.2379
DOC NO: 1110NN08

Dear Dr. Hammatt:

SUBJECT: National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 Review – (REVISED) Archaeological Inventory Survey Plan for City Center PHASE 4 of the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project Kalihi, Kapālama, and Honolulu Ahupua'a, Honolulu District, Island of O'ahu TMK: (3) 7-4-021: 002

Thank you for requesting our review of the (Revised) Archeological Inventory Survey Plan (AISP) titled *Archaeological Inventory Survey Plan for the City Center (Construction Phase 4) of the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project, Kaliki, Kapālama, and Honolulu Ahupua`a, Honolulu Disctrict, Island of O'ahu TMK: [1] 1-2, 1-5, 1-7, 2-1, 2-3 (Various Plats and Parcels) Volume I: Plan and Appendices F and G* and *Volume II: Appendices A-E, Land Documents by* Hammatt, et.al (CSH report code KALIHI 17), received by our office on August 12, 2011. This AISP was prepared in compliance with National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Review.

The AISP explains the intent to identify and record any remaining historic sites and cultural deposits located within the 13.87 acre project corridor that extends east along the southern coast of O'ahu from Kalihi Stream on Dillingham Boulevard to Ala Moana Center on Kona Street. Project construction will require relocation of existing utility lines within the project corridor that conflict with the proposed Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project. Amongst other land disturbing activities including grading of facility locations, and excavations for the guide way column foundations, relocating utilities will cause the most disturbances.

This plan meets the standards for Archaeological Inventory Survey Plans that are set forth in HAR 13-284-5 (c). Please send one hardcopy of the document, clearly marked **FINAL**, along with a copy of this review letter and a text-searchable PDF version on CD to the Kapolei SHPD office, attention SHPD Library. Please contact Deona Naboa at Deona.Naboa@Hawaii.gov if you have any questions or concerns regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

Pua Aiu, PhD
Administrator
Historic Preservation Division