



## 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