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Executive Summary

At the request of Mr. George Yoshida, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation of the County of Hawai‘i, Kepā Maly, Cultural Resources Specialist (Kumu Pono Associates), conducted a study of cultural resources in the ahupua‘a (land division) of La‘aloa-iki (1st), in the district of North Kona, Island of Hawai‘i (TMK:7-7-10,36). The work was done in conjunction with the proposed development of park improvements on a c. 1.5 acre parcel of land at the La‘aloa Beach Park (formerly called Magic Sands Beach Park), and was performed in compliance with recommendations and guidelines of the Department of Land and Natural Resources-State Historic Preservation Division (DLNR-SHPD). The multifaceted study is presented in three primary sections, and provides readers with the findings of: (a) archival and historic documentary research; (b) a limited oral history study; and (c) documents community recommendations regarding implementation (for both interim and long-term protection measures) of an archaeological site preservation plan.

Background Research

As a part of this study, historical research, oral history interviews, and consultation were conducted primarily between January 6th to February 28, 1997 (though discussion with community members continued through May 19, 1997). Oral history interviews and/or consultation records representing nineteen individuals are included in this study. The interviewees and consultation participants included: (a) individuals with familial ties to the lands of La‘aloa-Pāhoehe dating back to pre-1848; (b) former owners of the study area parcel; (c) individuals concerned about and participating in stewardship of the cultural resources of La‘aloa; and (d) representatives of regulatory agencies. As a result of those communications, this document presents recommendations for both interim and long-term site preservation and interpretation, and recommendations for protection of burial remains.

It is also noted here, that Marc Smith, Hawai‘i Island Archaeologist with the DLNR-SHPD, along with Virginia Goldstein, James Head, and Carol Kawachi conducted archaeological investigation in the study area in 1995. That work (Smith et al., in prep) is presently being written up, and will undoubtedly contribute to the interpretation and long-term preservation treatment of the La‘aloa sites and should be reviewed once completed. In order to help make this study as comprehensive as possible, a general overview of archaeological findings (i.e., types of cultural sites, site numbers, and general treatment recommendations) has been included here, the result of personal conversations with Marc Smith.

Preservation Plan Recommendations

As a result of findings from archival research, oral history interviews, and consultation with members of the community and agency representatives, four preservation areas (Areas A-D) are identified in this study. These areas are:

Area A—including the heiau of Haukālūa and a reinternment site; a stone platform; a canoe landing (identified through oral history interviews); a papamū (Hawaiian checker board); and poho palu (bait mortars) (Sites 2009, 20,764, 21,221, 21222, and 21,223 respectively). Haukālūa Heiau (Site 2009) with its burial component, and the neighboring stone platform (Site 20,764), are to be
protected in a single preservation zone. The known burial remains will be protected in place, and any remains that may be identified in the future, will be treated on a case-by-case basis in conformance with Chapter 6E-43 (as amended by Act 306) and other applicable Hawaii State Laws. The remaining historic components with this preservation area are located on State land.

Area B—an ahupua’a boundary wall (Site 21,218), situated between La’aloa-iki and Pāhoehoe 4th.

Area C—a spring (Site 21,219), identified in oral history interviews; with such a site also referenced in historic narratives recorded by Reinecke (1930) and Nāluahine Ka‘ōpu (c. 1950).

Area D—a Kū‘ula (ancient fishing deity stone) (Site 21220).

In this study, it is recorded by kūpuna with familial ties to the land of La‘aloa, that the site identified as Haukālua Heiau (Site 2009) has undergone significant alterations (since early 1996). The kūpuna suggest that coral modifications to the heiau platform be removed, and that the heiau be protected as it was in their youth. Additional site specific protection and maintenance treatment recommendations, and samples of interpretive texts for each of the preservation areas are presented in the last section of this document. Overall, this study is meant to provide Hawaii County and community members with baseline information that will help them identify and implement site preservation treatments for cultural resources of the La‘aloa study area. The study also sets forth a basic foundation by which a partnership can be formed between community members and the County for long-term stewardship of the area’s cultural and natural resources.

**County and Community Review**

The draft study and preservation plan was submitted to the County of Hawaii on March 12, 1996. In the period between on April 9th and May 19th 1997, follow-up meetings and a pre-final study review between some of the study participants, individuals interested in stewardship of the resources, and the County of Hawaii were conducted. The goal being to ensure that the present study adequately addressed community concerns for site preservation and interpretation, and park use. As of those meetings, it was found that the majority consensus was that the plan should be implemented as set forth. Program managers of the County of Hawaii concurred (see Appendices A-C).
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INTRODUCTION

Background
At the request of Mr. George Yoshida, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation of the County of Hawai‘i, Kepā Maly, Cultural Resources Specialist (Kumu Pono Associates), conducted archival and historic documentary research, an oral history and consultation study, and prepared an archaeological site preservation plan based on the findings of the first two facets of the study, for a parcel of land (approximately 1.5 acres) in the ahupua‘a (land division) of La‘aloa-iki (1st), in the district of North Kona, Island of Hawai‘i (TMK:7-7-10,36) (Figure 1.). The purpose of this study and preservation plan is to satisfy the mitigation requirements of the Department of Land and Natural Resources-State Historic Preservation Division (DLNR-SHPD) in connection with the proposed development, by the County of Hawaii, of the La‘aloa Beach Park improvements. The preservation plan has been formulated in compliance with the recommendations of: (a) the Department of Land and Natural Resources - State Historic Preservation Division (DLNR-SHPD); (b) the Hawai‘i County Planning Department; and (c) guidelines for preservation plan development as set forth in Title 13, Subtitle 13, Chapters 276:4,5,7; 277:3,4,5,6,7,8,9 (Draft—December 12, 1996), Title 13, Subtitle 13, Chapter 300:36,40, (September 28, 1996); and §6E-43 (as amended by Act 306). The present document also incorporates DLNR-SHPD review comments on the pre-final version of the study (KPA Report La05a-030597), as outlined in correspondence from Don Hibbard, Administrator—Historic Preservation Division to Dean Uchida, Administrator—Land Division (July 30, 1997).

Study Organization
Following the introduction section, this report is divided into four primary, and interrelated sections. It incorporates several sources of information, among which are: (I) archival and historic documentation; (II) documentation from primary archaeological studies; (III) presents recommendations on site treatment as derived through consultation with individuals familiar with the La‘aloa area (i.e., people with familial and/or residency ties to the land, and/or stewardship interests in area resources); and (IV) a site preservation plan based on the findings of items I-III, and guidelines of DLNR-SHPD. This report provides Hawaii County and community members with baseline information that is meant to help them identify and implement both interim (short-term) and long-term site preservation treatments for cultural and archaeological features associated with the La‘aloa study area. The preservation plan seeks to set forth culturally sensitive preservation and interpretive management actions that will promote protection of the resources, and foster public education and awareness of Hawaiian archaeological and cultural sites. The plan is also meant to be dynamic, allowing for updating preservation treatments, interpretive mechanisms, and stewardship opportunities, thus fostering long-term preservation of La‘aloa’s cultural sites and history.

La‘aloa: A Cultural-Environmental Context
Upon investigation, one finds that the history of La‘aloa is closely tied to that of the lands that neighbor it, and that the larger area was one of political importance in the history of the

1 Communications of Don Hibbard, Administrator, State Historic Preservation Division, to Virginia Goldstein, Director, Planning Department, County of Hawaii (September 3, 1993 and May 23, 1996).
island of Hawai‘i. A number of important historical references record that the area between modern day Kailua Town to Keauhou (including La‘aloa), was favored by the ali‘i nui (high ranking chiefs) of the island of Hawai‘i as a residence and significant political seat (cf. I‘i 1959, Kamakau 1961, Ellis 1963, and Fornander 1917-1919).

Figure 1. La‘aloa Study Area.
The immediate study area is situated on the pāhoehoe lava shore line of the ahupua’a (a traditional Hawaiian land division) of La’alōa-iki (also called La’alōa 1st), North Kona District, on the leeward coast of the Island of Hawai’i. The near ocean shoreline is generally made up of large slabs of pāhoehoe lava, washed by the ocean waves. Loose water-worn rocks are scattered along the high water line, which now, also marks the beginning of the makai (shoreward) boundaries of cultural sites (e.g. the heiau, Haukālua and a stone platform overlooking La’alōa or Hōpoe Bay). Immediately mauka (inland) of the high water line, in the little pockets and gullies in the pāhoehoe flows, are deposits of soil, some of which includes midden deposits from past human occupation. The ocean fronting La’alōa, like that of the greater Kona region, was noted for its rich fisheries. The near shore plains (kula kahakai) were relatively rich, supporting dry land agricultural fields, and residences, and as the Hawaiian social and political systems evolved, the mauka lands also came to support habitations and extensive field systems as well. It is within this land division, La’alōa, we find the current study area, which is bounded by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directional Reference</th>
<th>Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mauka</td>
<td>Ali‘i Drive;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keauhou</td>
<td>Hōpoe Bay (also called La’alōa Bay); the ocean;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makai</td>
<td>the point of Huihui and boundary wall between the ahupua’a of La’alōa-iki and Pāhoehoe 4th (land division names recorded in Grant 2034, awarded to Kaupehe in 1855), and the present-day La’alōa Beach Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on historical accounts and archaeological studies (cf. Ellis 1963, Thrum 1908, Stokes and Dye 1991, Reinecke Ms. 1930, Newman 1974, Kelly 1983, and Tomonari-Tuggle 1985), a general model characterizing major changes in the prehistoric period can be proposed. This model extends from c. AD 1000 to AD 1778, when Captain James Cook arrived in the islands:

1 - In the period from pre-AD 1000 to the 1300s, the sheltered bays of Kona (which were also supplied by numerous fresh water sources) were settled. The primary livelihood focused on the collection of marine resources, and near residence agriculture.

2 - By the c. 1300s selected areas in the uplands, to around the 3000 foot elevation were being cultivated, and an ‘ohana (extended family) system of social, religious, political, and economic values linked coastal and inland inhabitants.

3 - In the third period, generally the 16th-18th centuries, there evolved a greater separation between the ali‘i, or chiefly class and the maka‘āinana (commoners). The Hawaiian population grew, and concurrently, land use practices expanded. An extensive dryland agricultural field system developed in the uplands. The native system of land management by moku (districts), ‘okana (sub-districts), ahupua’a (land divisions generally including resources from the mountains to the sea), ‘ili (smaller land units which were developed for their resources, within the larger ahupua’a), and other smaller land units
was formalized in this period as well. The land provided the fruits and vegetables for the diet, and the ocean provided most of the protein. This system of land management also set the basis of Hawaiian land use and distribution through the early 19th century.
I. LAʻALOA: AN OVERVIEW OF SELECTED LEGENDARY AND EARLY HISTORIC ACCOUNTS

To-date, only a few legendary references have been located that mention Laʻaloa by name. This may perhaps be explained by the fact that in this region of Kona, there are numerous ahupuaʻa, most of which are relatively narrow. Additionally, there are the well watered and larger, protected bays of Keauhou and Kahaluʻu to the south of Laʻaloa, and Kaiakeakua (Kailua) to its north. Legendary and early historical accounts document that these locales, served as the significant political seats of the region. Early narratives also record that the ahupuaʻa between Keōpū (Kailua) and Kahaluʻu—including Laʻaloa—were home to various aliʻi, their retainers, and people who worked the land. Thus, the histories and families of Laʻaloa and it’s neighbors were closely interrelated with those of the political seats.

A Story of Hāwaʻe

One of the earliest legendary narratives which makes reference to Laʻaloa and it’s ceremonial associations with various lands in the district of Kona, was found in the collection of Charles R. Bishop (c. 1880s), at the archives of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum. The Hawaiian narratives, recorded by “an old native” of Kona, are set in the c. early 1500s by association with Ehu, the ruling chief of Kona at that time. The legend tells readers about the priest Hāwaʻe, who was born in a supernatural form, and raised in a heiau, and how he came to be the priest of Ehu. Because of his exceptional skills as a kahuna (priest), images which bore his name were placed in heiau throughout the district of Kona. According to this informant, Hāwaʻe lived at the heiau of Lele-ʻiwi (Bone altar), in an upland area of Laʻaloa. A brief synopsis of the narratives (as translated by the author), is offered here:

Hāwaʻe is the name of one of the gods, worshipped by the ancient people of these islands. This god was famous for his mana (power), and ability to help those who cared for him. In this story of the priestly order, Hāwaʻe was of the seventeenth order of priests descended from Haumea... Because Hāwaʻe was expert in various practices of the priests, he was became the foremost priest of Ehu Kaipo, the chief who controlled the island of Hawaiʻi, who dwelt above the trail known as Ehu Kaipo (ke ala Ehu) in North Kona. The chief would continually called upon the name of his priest and seer, Hāwaʻe, because there was no one more powerful than he...

The Stone Images that were given the Name of Hāwaʻe

There were eight images which were all called by the name Hāwaʻe. The first image was hidden near the heiau Ka-houpo-o-Kāne at Kapuʻa. The second image was hidden in an ocean cave in front of Hale-o-Keawe. The third image was hidden in a cave near the heiau called Hai-ʻu-lani in Hōlualoa 4. The fourth image was in the uplands of Laʻaloa, North Kona, near the heiau called Lele-ʻiwi. It was at this heiau that the priest Hāwaʻe also dwelt. The fifth image was hidden near the heiau called Ku-hoʻopio-ka-lā, above Kailua. The sixth image was on the north side of the hill of Huʻehuʻe in Kekaha. It was broken apart when the road was made. The seventh image was in the uplands of Waʻiʻaha, place in the spring of Wai-kīʻi, near the heiau of Papa-kōlea. The eighth image was found there in the heiau of Kuahua, at Kukui-o-Lauka...
The order of priests of Keawe’aikō were the last to care for these images. It is because so many of these images were kept at the various heiau, that the saying came about “Ho’okāhī wale no o Hāwā’e, lauhue Kona” (There is only one Hāwā’e, all Kona is covered with the vines of the poison gourd). (Bishop Museum, Hawaiian Ethnological Notes, Vol. I:486-489).

As a result of research conducted by the author of this study over the period of several years, little known legendary accounts, recorded by native historians, in Hawaiian language newspaper have also been located. These accounts do provide us additional glimpses into some of the history and significance of La’aloa. Excerpts of those legendary accounts, as translated by the author of this study are included here.

“Ka'ao Ho'oniu Pu'uwai no Ka-Miki”

The Heart Stirring Story (Legend) of Ka-Miki

The “legend of Ka-Miki” is a long and complex legend, that was published over a period of four years (1914-1917) in the weekly Hawaiian-language newspaper Ka Hōkū o Hawai‘i. The legend appears to have been recorded for the paper primarily by Hawaiian historians John Wise and J.W.H.I. Kihe, noted Hawaiian scholars of the late 1800s through the early 1900s. While “Ka-Miki” is not an ancient account, the authors used a mixture of local legends, tales, and family traditions in association with place names to tie together fragments of site specific stories that had been handed down over the generations. Thus, while in many cases, the personification of individuals and their associated place names may not be “ancient,” the site documentation within the “story of Ka-Miki” is of both cultural and historical value.

The legend is an account of two supernatural brothers, Ka-Miki (The quick, or adept, one) and Maka-'iole (Rat [squinting] eyes], who traveled around the island of Hawai‘i along the ancient ala loa and ala hele (trails and paths) that encircled the island. During their journey, the brothers competed alongside the trails they traveled, and in famed kahua (contest arenas) and royal courts, against ʻōlohe (experts skilled in fighting or in other competitions, such as running, fishing, debating, or solving riddles, that were practiced by the ancient Hawaiians). They also challenged priests whose dishonorable conduct offended the gods of ancient Hawai‘i. Ka-Miki and Maka-'iole were empowered by their ancestress Ka-uluhe-nui-hihi-kolo-i-uka (The great entangled growth of uluhe fern which spreads across the uplands), a manifestation of the goddess Haumea (the creative force of nature; also called Papa or Hina; who was also a goddess of priests and competitors).

The English translations below, are a synopsis of the Hawaiian texts, with emphasis upon the main events of the narratives:

Born in ‘e’epa (mysterious – premature) forms, Ka-Miki and Maka-'iole were the children of Pōhaku-o-Kāne (k) and Kapa’ihilani (w), the ali‘i of the lands of Kohana-iki and Kaloko. Maka-'iole was the first born child and Ka-Miki was the second. Following their birth, Ka-Miki was given up for dead and placed in the cave of Pōnahanaha. Ka-uluhe retrieved Ka-Miki from the cave and reared him at Kalama‘ula on the heights of Hualālai. It was there that Ka-uluhe began instructing Ka-Miki in the uses of his supernatural powers, and when Maka-'iole joined his young brother, together, they learned various techniques of contest skills, in preparation for their journey around Hawai‘i Island.
After a period of training and tests, the brothers joined their ancestress in an 'awa ceremony. When Ka-uluhe-nui-hihi-kolo-i-uka (Ka-uluhe) fell asleep, the brothers ventured from their residence at Kalama'ula to visit some of the places of Kona. Their journey took them as far as the cliffs of Kealakekua, and upon returning to Kalama'ula, Ka-uluhe inquired about what the brothers had seen. As they described the places visited, Ka-uluhe explained to the brothers the nature of the lands, features and people which they had seen [the places they visited include sites within the current study area]. In these selected narratives, we learn that the lands of Pāhoehoe, La'aloa and Kāpala'alae were part of a land division ('okana), ruled by the chief named Kaumalumalu, and that Hāwā'e, a skilled priest of La'aloa, was held in high esteem by the chief Pili.

Place Name: Kaumalumalu

Narrative: ...Kaumalumalu was named for the chief Kaumalumalu, he was the – ali'i 'ai ahupua'a, me nā paukū 'āina a me nā 'okana 'āina o Pāhoehoe, La'aloa, a me Kāpala'alae... (April 9, 1914)

Place Name: Pāhoehoe

Narrative: La'aloa and Kāpala'alae — chief to whom the sub-districts and land parcels of Pāhoehoe, La'aloa and Kāpala'alae answered. The saying “Kaumalumalu i ka hēkua’wa” (Kaumalumalu is like a sheltered, or shaded valley) is said in praise of the calm and beauty of this area... (April 9, 1914)

Following his journey around the island of Hawai'i, Ka-Miki went to Niumalu (identified in text as being situated in the ahupua'a of Pu'a'a) where the sacred chief Pili-nui-kapu-ku'i-a-ka-lani-kua-liholiho-i-ke-kapu (Pili bound in great sacredness, the chief with the burning back kapu — a restriction that forbade approaching the chief from behind, and which carried a penalty of death by fire) held his court. At that time, the chief was at Hinakahua, the kahua or contest arena that was situated on the plain of Kahelo in the ahupua'a of Puapua'a. Pili was a great enthusiast of competitions, and all manner of contests were held at Hinakahua. At Hinakahua, Ka-Miki set in motion his plan to become the foremost champion of the chief Pili. Preparing to compete against the champions of Pili, Ka-Miki entered the kahua and called out in a chant to his ancestress and those who would compete against him. The priest Hāwā'e, who resided at La'aloa, and was in company of the chief Pili—the narratives describe the event:

Place Name: Keikipu'ipu'i

Narrative: Hearing the chant, the priest and seer Hāwā'e, who was sitting at Pili's side said, 'This youth is indeed mysterious, he is no ordinary 'ōlohe.' Now Hāwā'e was a famous priest in the time of Pili, and he told the chief what he knew of Ka-Miki's accomplishments while traveling around Hawai'i. Pili then called upon Keikipu'ipu'i to compete with Ka-Miki. Keikipu'ipu'i was defeated, and then Kauakāhiakahāola and all the other athlete-warrior competitors who served Pili were defeated and bound by Ka-Miki. Pili then called on Ko'o-kā (now the name of a surf at Pu'a'a) the master instructor of lua (hand-to-hand fighting) and ha'iha'i (bone breaking), and he too was defeated. With this turn of events, Pili called his foremost seers and advisors Wai'aha, Ho'opio'opio, Hāwā'e, and Ku'eho'opio'okalā, to determine whether the contest should be continued. Pili asked his advisors, "Where in all Kona could a competitor be found to compete with this 'ōlohe?"

Hāwā'e told Pili, "I warned you that there was no one who had beaten this 'ōlohe," and Ho'opio'opio, Ku'eho'opio'okalā agreed that no champion remained. Wai'aha remained silent, looking down and thinking. He then told Pili that perhaps there were two 'ōlohe, the twins Kanahāhā and Ka-alapū'ali, also called Nā Hau o Mā'ihi (The dew-mists of
"He Moʻolelo Kaʻao No Kepakaʻiiliʻula. . ."
A Story about Kepakaʻiiliʻula. . .
Like Ka-Miki, the story of Kepakaʻiiliʻula is about a youth who was born in an 'e'epa (premature - mysterious) form, who was given up for dead by his parents. Kepakaʻiiliʻula's father was Makaokū, and his mother was Hina-ai-ka-malama, both of whom were descended from Kūahailo and Hina the akua-aliʻi (god-chiefs) who came from Kahiki and established the highest chiefly bloodlines of Hawai'i. At the time of Kepakaʻiiliʻula's birth, Makaokū and Hina dwelt near Moku-ola (now called Coconut Island) and ruled the district of Hilo. Without the knowledge of Makaokū or Hina, Kiʻinoho and Kiʻihele rescued Kepakaʻiiliʻula and raised him while instructing him in all manner of fighting techniques, and in the uses of his supernatural powers. By association with other figures identified in the legend, the time period seems to be set in the 16th century, immediately before the time of Lono-i-ka-Makahiki.

This version of the legend was printed in Ka Hōkū o Hawaiʻi (March 20, 1919 - December 9, 1920), and it differs substantially from the versions published in the Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore (1917, IV-III:498-517 and 1919, V-II:384-405). The earliest published accounts of Kepakaʻiiliʻula date back to c.1863, and this version of the legend is attributed to David Malo (IN Ka Hōkū o Hawaiʻi, March 13 and 20, 1919). The following narratives are paraphrased translations of the Hawaiian texts, with emphasis on the main places, individuals, and events associated with lands of the present study area:

When Kepakaʻiiliʻula came of age, his uncles went in search of a suitably beautiful and highly ranked chiefess to whom Kepakaʻiiliʻula could be married. The journey took them around Hawaiʻi, where they met with sacred chiefesses of the island’s districts. In Kona, the uncles met with the chief Keolonāhihi and his wife Kahaluʻu, who were parents of the sacred chiefess Mākoleʻā. Mākoleʻā was found to be the most suitable chiefess for Kepakaʻiiliʻula, and a wedding was arranged. When the uncles departed, Keolonāhihi was approached by Kaikipanaanea, a chief from Maui, who also sought out Mākoleʻā as a wife. Keolonāhihi then broke the betrothal between Kepakaʻiiliʻula and Mākoleʻā, and this set in motion the events of the legend’s narratives.

In the selected excerpts below, we learn of a great agricultural field that extended from Kaumalumalu to Kāpalaʻalaea, thus including the ahupuaʻa of Laʻaloa. The narratives indicate that Laʻaloa and the larger region shared a common relationship under the aliʻi Kahoʻoaliʻi:

Place Name: Narrative:

Kaumalumalu, Once in Kona, Kepakaʻiiliʻula waited in the uplands of Kahaluʻu at the great banana
Kāpalaʻalaea, and Keʻei plantation of the chief Kahoʻoaliʻi, which extended from Kaumalumalu-Kāpalaʻalaea to
Kiʻihele, Kiʻinoho and Kepakaʻiiliʻula traveled from Hilo to Kona. Along their journey they visited many places and individuals, and participated in events of historical importance to the lands of Hawaiʻi.
made ready, Kepaka'i'ili'ula and his guardians descended to the shore of Kahalu'u, where they stood not far from the royal house of Mākole'ā.

Hōlualoa and La'aloa in the Legend of Kauma'i'ili'ula
An account found in Beckwith's “Hawaiian Mythology” (1970) tells us that Hōlualoa and La'aloa were husband and wife. Paraphrased, the legend tells us that:

Hōlualoa and La'aloa had ten children, “the five boys were named Kalino, Lulu-kaina, Ahewahewa, Wawa, and Mumu; and the five girls, the four maile sisters and Kaulana” (Beckwith 1970:517). The eldest girl, Maile-lau-li'i, married the chief Hikapoloa of Kohala, and lived in the uplands of Pu'uepa. To them was born a son who was named Ka'-ili-'a'ala, who married Wai-kua-'a'ala (also the name of a famous pond on the shore of Kahalu'u). Ka'-ili-'a'ala and Wai-kua-'a'ala had four children, one of them, Lu'ukia, married the chief Olopana in Kahiki. Kaupe'a, Olopana's daughter by another marriage, married Kaumailiula, Lu'ukia's younger brother. Through their union was born Ka-maka-o-ke-ahi, and from him is descended Ka-hihi-o-ka-lani. (Beckwith 1970:517)

Today, as traced from the genealogy cited above, descendants of Hōlualoa and La'aloa may still be found.

The Prophesy of Kapihe
Perhaps one of the most significant historic references associated with La'aloa (by association with the identified place names) is found in the writings of Kamakau (1961) and Malo (1951). It is reported that the kāula (seer prophet) Kapihe prophesied (in the c. 1770s) the rise of Kamehameha I, his unification of the islands under one rule, and the overthrow of the ancient religious and kapu system. In this great prophesy are referenced the lands of Hōlualoa and Kuamo'o at Mā'ihi, and those lands between these two ahupua'a (including La'aloa) crossing the current study area. Their reference can only be taken as one which demonstrates the importance of this lands in the period of history being described. Kamakau recorded:

Ka-pihe the seer prophesied in the presence of Kamehameha and said, “There shall be a long malo reaching from Kuamo'o to Holualoa. The islands shall come together, the tabus shall fall. The high shall be brought low, and the low shall rise to heaven.” The prophesy was fulfilled when the battle was fought at Kuamo'o for the downfall of the ancient tabus [in 1820]. Holualoa was the long malo uniting the kingdom from Kahiki to Hawaii. The kingdom of the gods fell, and the believers rose to the heavens. Part of the prophesy is still being fulfilled... (Kamakau 1961:223).

In David Malo’s “Hawaiian Antiquities” (1951), we find additional details on this prophecy recorded in the notes of Nathaniel Emerson:

Kapihe was a noted kaula of the last century, living in Kona, Hawaii, at the time when Kamehameha was a general under Kalaniopuu. To Kapihe was ascribed the following oracular utterance (wanana) which is of the nature of a prophecy:

E iho ana o luna; That which is above shall be brought down;
E pii ana o lalo; That which is below shall be lifted up;
E hui ana na moku; The islands shall be united;
Kamehameha did indeed rise to power, and by 1795, he had gained control of all the islands except Kaua‘i and Ni‘ihau. By 1810, these last two islands were ceded to Kamehameha by their king, Kaumualii (Kamakau 1961:196). Additionally, within six months following the death of Kamehameha I, the religious kapu were overthrown, and the Kaua ‘ai noa (Battle of free eating) was fought at Kuamo‘o, thus overthrowing the ancient system of honoring the gods and restricting men and women from eating together (ibid.:223, 226-227).

Another version of this prophesy was published in the Hawaiian newspaper “Ka Hae Hawaii” on May 23, 1860 (ms. Maly, translator). One of the readers, simply identified as “S.,” offered the following short history to the editor of the paper (translated by the author of this study):

**He Wanana (A Prophesy)**

Perhaps you have heard about the prophesy made by Kapihe, before Kamehameha first. If perhaps you have not, here is the prophesy — Kamehameha returned to Hawaii with the Niaukani [fleet of canoes and ships in c. 1812], he dwelt at Holualoa in North Kona. Kapihe was a person who dwelt at Kuamoo, and he was at times considered to be somewhat crazy [a result of his gift of prophesy]. He traveled from Kuamoo to Holualoa with a long malo (loin cloth), prophesizing before the King. This is what he said:

E hui ana na aina, The lands shall be united;
E iho mai ana ko ka lani, That which is above shall come down,
E pii aku ana ko lalo nei, That which is below shall rise above,
E iho mai ana ke Akua ilalo nei, The God shall come down,
E kamailio pu ana me kanaka, Speaking with mankind,
E pii mai ana o Wakea iluna, Wakea shall rise up,
E iho aku ana o Milo ilalo, Milo shall descend,
E noho pu ana ke akua me kanaka. The gods shall dwell like men.

[IN Ka Hae Hawaii. Mei 23, 1860:32]

(Readers may also be interested in reviewing an eyewitness account of these narratives, as recorded by Gideon La'anui in The Hawaiian Annual (Laanui 1930:92). La'anui's narratives, originally published in the Hawaiian newspaper “Kumu Hawaii" in 1838, place the event in the period following the N'iaukani—return of Kamehameha to Hawai'i in 1812, as do the narratives from Ka Hae Hawaii above.)

**The Journal of William Ellis (1823)**

In 1823, British missionary William Ellis and members of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) toured the island of Hawai‘i seeking out community centers in which to establish church centers for the growing Calvinist mission. Ellis' Journal (Ellis 1963) contains perhaps the earliest writings that mention a journey through the Pāhoehoe-La‘aloa area. His writings offer readers a glimpse into the nature of the coastline community that existed between Kailua to Keauhou. On July 18, 1823, Ellis and his missionary companions traveled through the lands of the current study area, via the ala loa or ancient foot trail near the coast. It is noted here, that there are a number of documentary resources (eg. Māhele records, journal accounts, and survey documentation)
that place the ancient ala loa in the vicinity of the “Government Road” which passes through the study area.

Along the eight mile stretch of land between Kailua to Keauhou, Ellis counted 610 houses and 19 heiau, and estimated the uplands contained another 100 houses. Allowing five persons to a house, Ellis and his companions estimated that there were 3,550 persons in the area (Ellis 1963:76). Ellis’ narratives provide readers with further descriptions of the communities and agricultural field systems through which the group passed; he notes:

The houses, which are neat, are generally built on the sea-shore, shaded with cocoa-nut and kou trees, which greatly enliven the scene. The environs were cultivated to a considerable extent; small gardens were seen among the barren rocks on which the houses are built, wherever soil could be found sufficient to nourish the sweet potato, the watermelon, or even a few plants of tobacco, and in many places these seemed to be growing literally in the fragments of lava, collected in small heaps around their roots. ...[W]alked towards the mountains, to visit the high and cultivated parts of the district. After travelling over the lava for about a mile, the hollows in the rocks began to be filled with a light brown soil; about half a mile further, the surface was entirely covered with a rich mould, formed by decayed vegetable matter and decomposed lava.

Here they enjoyed the agreeable shade of bread-fruit and ohia trees... ...The path now lay through a beautiful part of the country, quite a garden compared with that through which they had passed on first leaving town. It was generally divided into small fields, about fifteen rods square, fenced with low stone walls, built with fragments of lava gathered from the surface of the enclosures. These fields were planted with bananas, sweet potatoes, mountain taro, paper mulberry plants, melons, and sugar cane, which flourished luxuriantly in every direction (Ellis 1963:31-32).

In the vicinity of Pāhoehoe-La'aloa, Ellis recorded:

**CANOE MAKING—FUTURE STATE DISCUSSED [Pāhoehoe to Kahalu'u]**
We walked on to Pahoehe, where we entered a large house, in which many workmen were employed in making canoes. About fifty people soon after assembled around us. We asked them if they would like to hear about the true God, and the way of salvation? They answered, Yes. I then addressed them for about twenty minutes on the first principles of the gospel. As soon as I began to speak, they all sat down and observed perfect silence.

Shortly after this service we took our leave, and proceeded along the shore to Kahalu'u; where a smart shower of rain obliged us to take shelter in a house by the road side. While resting there, the voice of wailing reached our ears. We inquired whence it came? and were informed by the people of the house, that a sick person in the neighbourhood had just expired... ...continued the conversation till the rain abated, when we pursued our journey. . . (ibid.:75-76)
LA‘ALOA: LAND TENURE

By the 1830s, the foreign influence in Hawai‘i was urging a system of privatization of land ownership. By 1848, Kauikaouli, King Kamehameha III, entered into legislation that allowed for private ownership of land. Called the Māhele ‘Āina (Land Division), for the first time in the history of the Hawaiian nation, commoners were allowed to claim land upon which they lived and worked. One of the requirements of the Māhele was that commoners provide proof of their land use and tenancy on parcels being claimed. Except for cases where disputes arose, the “royal claims” rarely included any documentation. For the native tenants, this “requirement of proof” produced a series of volumes of registry of claims and testimony to confirm claims (i.e., the Native Register and Native Testimony). Today, these volumes—the Buke Māhele—provide us with documentation of various aspects of land use practices, crop production, resource harvesting, and architectural site occurrences (i.e., the locations of walls, terraces, platforms, wells, and trails etc.) of the time. While the records of the Māhele are of great value, it is also important to remember that at the time of the Māhele, the well-being of the Hawaiian population was in a state of turmoil. Throughout Hawai‘i, the Hawaiian population was declining and introduced herbivores and crop plants were leading to changes in residency, land use practices, and the landscape.

The Māhele records document that native customs associated with dryland agriculture in Kona were still being practiced. Early residents and visitors to the Kailua area (e.g., I‘i 1959, Kamakau 1961, Ellis 1963, and Wilkes 1845) recorded that in the area of Kona between Kailua-Keauhou, native cultivation crossed several environmental zones, ranging from the coastal and mid-land kula to the ‘āma‘uma‘u forest area.

Claims and Testimonies of the Māhele (1848)

A complete review of both Native Register (NR) and Native Testimony (NT) books was done as a part of this study. None of the kuleana (claimed or awarded) appear to have been associated with parcel of the proposed La‘aloa Beach Park expansion. In the matter of the identified claimants for land in La‘aloa, it was found that the Native Testimonies provide a more detailed record than those of the Native Register—thus the testimonies are cited here. Tables 1-a and 1-b below, identify native residents, and summarizes the record they provided in the matter of land use in c. 1848.

**Table 1-a. Disposition of La‘aloa Ahupua‘a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ahupua‘a</th>
<th>Helu (Claim Number)</th>
<th>Awardee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La‘aloa 1st</td>
<td>7716:4 (ahupuaa; Indices of Awards:483)</td>
<td>Ruth Keelikolani, daughter of Pauahi and Kahalaila. She was the half sister of Kamehameha IV and V, and Victoria Kamamalu. She was also married to Kuakini’s hanai, Leleiohoku. La‘aloa 2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1-b. Individual Kuleana Claims in La‘aloa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ahupua‘a</th>
<th>LCA Helu &amp; Apana</th>
<th>Awardee</th>
<th>Ili and/or Land Use</th>
<th>Source of Cited Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laaloa 1st</td>
<td>10566:</td>
<td>Opunui</td>
<td>In the ili of Ohiki:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Fourteen cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - In the kalulu, sixteen cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - In the pahee, eight cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NT Vol. 4:602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1-b. Individual Kuleana Claims in La'aloa (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ahupuaa &amp; Apana</th>
<th>LCA Helu</th>
<th>Awardee</th>
<th>Ili and/or Land Use</th>
<th>Source of Cited Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laaloa 1st</td>
<td>10566:</td>
<td>Opunui</td>
<td>4 - On the kula, eight cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - In the ili of Ulaole, four cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Enclosed house lot with two houses, makai is the Government Road. There are several loulu trees are at Palaeuka, and one hala tree is at Kaumalumalu. One hog and four loulu trees have been sold. Old land from the time of Kamehameha I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laaloa 2nd</td>
<td>5770</td>
<td>Kalua</td>
<td>In the ili of Puhau:</td>
<td>NT Vol. 4:613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Laaloa 1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - One partially cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - In Pahohoe 3, two cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - In Laaloa 1, one cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laaloa 2nd</td>
<td>10888</td>
<td>Nahuakoa</td>
<td>In the ili of Kamuku, Laaloa 2:</td>
<td>NT Vol. 4:614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - One cultivated pauku, bounded on the Kau side by the ili of Apa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laaloa 2nd</td>
<td>10889</td>
<td>Manuunuu</td>
<td>In the ili of Apa:</td>
<td>NT Vol. 4:614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laaloa 2nd</td>
<td>5773</td>
<td>Kelepaa</td>
<td>In the ili of Ulukukahii:</td>
<td>NT Vol. 4:605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Three cultivated kihapai, no house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - In the kaluulu, one cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - In the pahee, one irrigated pauku, it will be planted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laaloa 2nd</td>
<td>5787:1</td>
<td>Kanewa</td>
<td>In the ili of Kukuilauania:</td>
<td>NT Vol. 4:600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Enclosed house lot with six houses, the Alanui Aupuni is on the makai side. There are some plants and twelve loulu trees (kumu loulu), one niu tree, four kou trees planted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laaloa 2nd</td>
<td>5899</td>
<td>Pupu</td>
<td>In the ili of Waiaololi:</td>
<td>NT Vol. 4:609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - One cultivated pauku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - A house lot, the pa aina is on the mauka side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laaloa 2nd</td>
<td>5913</td>
<td>Pukai</td>
<td>In the ili of Kapukualua</td>
<td>NT Vol. 4:602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Eight cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Twenty cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Ten cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Seven cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - A house lot with five houses; mauka is the alanui, makai and Kohala is the beach, and on the Kau side is idle land. Old land from the time of Kamehameha I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1-b. Individual Kuleana Claims in La‘aloa (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ahupuaa</th>
<th>LCA Helu &amp; Apana</th>
<th>Awardee</th>
<th>Ili and/or Land Use</th>
<th>Source of Cited Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laaloa</td>
<td>10642:1</td>
<td>Puhi</td>
<td>In the ili of Kaailehua, Laaloa ahupuaa:</td>
<td>NT Vol. 4:600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Kapalaalaea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Ten cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Ten cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Three cultivated kihapai (Konohiki land on all boundaries 1-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Enclosed house lot with one house; land from his parents in time of Kamehameha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I. Untended land surrounds the lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the ili of Iliioa, Kapalaalae:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Two cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - In the pahee, four cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 - In the kaluulu, five cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 - In the apaa, five cultivated kihapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testimonies of the Boundary Commission Proceedings

Following the Māhele, a Boundary Commission was established to verify the boundaries of various Government and Crown lands. The primary informants for the boundary descriptions were old native residents of the lands, many of whom had also been claimants for kuleana during the Māhele. The narratives were collected primarily between c. 1873-1885; the testimonies were generally given in Hawaiian and transcribed in English as they occurred (pers. comm. Jean Greenwell, Kona Historical Society, January 19, 1996). Rufus Lyman, D. Howard Hitchcock, and Curtis Lyons were among those individuals who collected surveys and testimonies.

The following narratives are excerpts from the Boundary Commission Testimonies for the lands of La‘aloa and Kāpala‘alae. The narratives provide readers with documentation of land use patterns as recorded by native tenants at the time. Underlined place names are names also used in Māhele claims, or are names of areas of historical interest. It will be noted that specific reference is made to an iwi ‘āina (boundary wall) between Pāhoehoe (4th) and La‘aloa-iki (part of the boundary wall is still visible in the present study area). The name “Haukalua” is also used while identifying a locality near the boundary of Pāhoehoe and La‘aloa, and is associated with one of the grant parcels of Kīpapa. Unfortunately, the testimony does not make any reference to a heiau of the name, Haukālua.

Laaloa 1st (August 11, 1873)
Volume 1-A:330-331

Nahina k, Sworn: I was born at Pahoeohoe...at the time of Okuu, know the land of Laaloa 1st and its boundaries adjoining Pahoeohoe. Know the corner of Kīpapa’s land at the big stone wall, it is on Pahoeohoe and is called Haukalua [now the name given to the heiau]. Thence mauka along old ili aina between Laaloa 1st and Pahoeohoe to Puuheu, an oioina [a trail side resting place] with puuhala trees. Thence mauka to oioina o Puukukui, with kukui trees, thence to a pile of stones at the mauka Government road called Lehukapu. Thence to Kaukahoku by a spring of water, thence to Kaakukukui, a kahuaahale [house site]. Thence to Hehenapuweo, thence to Waialiiipoa, the mauka corner of Laaloa 1st and Pahoeohoe, where Kaumalumalu and Kahalu cut them off. Ancient fishing rights extending out to sea.
Kipapa (k) 2, Sworn: I was born in Puna...have lived in Pahoehoe...for over twenty years, and know a part of the boundaries between Laaloa and Pahoehoe... [the boundary description follows that of Nahina above, with the following additions regarding a feature around the Great Wall]...

The corner of my land on Pahoehoe, adjoining Laaloa is at a place called Puka auwai, a pile of stones by the gate in the big wall; thence mauka along the iwi aina by the old road. Thence along the road to Puuheu... ...Kaukahoku is a kihapi koele [a garden plot worked for the chief]...

Kapalaalaea 1st (August 11, 1873)
Volume 1-A:333

J.G. Hoapili states that this land is bounded entirely by Royal Patents, and makai by the sea and a few kuleanas. Royal Patents filed—No. 1865, Kanewa, Laaloanui. No. 1757 Kanewa, mauka. No. 1583, Kama, thence the kuleana of Naailkena and others, mauka No. 2809, Kahula. (For boundaries between this land and Laaloanui form shore to mauka end, the Patents are filed. No. 3052 Palaualilo, Kapalaalae 2nd makai. No. 1756, Keoke (Kekapa) makai. No. 3019 Kaaiopulu to sea shore.

Ranching: A Historic Overview

Perhaps the most significant impact on residency, land use, and the cultural and natural landscapes of La'aloa and greater Kona, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, were cattle. Various historical accounts record that many of the boundary division walls, like that between La'aloa-iki and Pāhoehoe 4th (a portion of which is situated in the study area) were built in-part to manage growing problems with cattle (e.g. I'i, 1959:111; Māhele testimonies; and Handy and Handy, 1972:526). The first cattle were given by Captain George Vancouver to Kamehameha I as gifts in 1793. Originally kept in large walled enclosures to protect them, by c. 1812, the cattle were roaming down to the shore in the area between Kailua and Keaouhi (cf. I'i IN Kuokoa, February 5, 1870:1, c-3; also see I'i 1959:11195-97; Wilkes 1845:4; Kamakau 1961:164; and Handy and Handy 1972:18). By 1815, herds of wild cattle had become a threat to native residents, agricultural field systems, and life, and Kamehameha I sought out and hired foreigners to help control the growing herds (cf. Barrera and Kelly 1974:44).

During the period leading up to the late 1850s, nearly all of the cattle belonged either to the King, the government, other chiefs close to the King, and a few foreigners who had been granted the right to handle the cattle (cf. Henke 1929:19-20). One of the most significant contributors to the development of large ranches like those of Kona, was the privatization of land ownership in the islands—the Māhele. By 1850, foreigners were granted the right to purchase large tracts of land—at times entire ahupua'a. Initially, in Kona, as in other ranching localities of the Hawaiian Island, the hides, tallow, and beef were the primary products of the ranching operations. But, by 1875 operating dairies and the production of butter, had become an important part of the business of Kona's ranchers (Sherwood Greenwell, 12th Annual Kona District Fair, July 1954:83; IN Springer, 1992:II-3). Thrum's Hawaiian Annual and Almanac of 1900, reported that while the numbers of cattle in the islands had dropped over the last quarter century (i.e. 1875-1900), large independent ranches were able to supply more than an adequate amount of beef for the island market.

---

2 Kipapa was the great-great-great-grandfather of members of the Makuakāne family who participated in interviews in this study
Thrum also observed that since c. 1875, the grazing range had been decreasing and cattle were forced into the higher elevations—thus, away from the coastal communities.

Through the first few decades of the century various members of the Greenwell family maintained their primary ranching operations on their mauka lands, extending from Kealakehe, Honokōhau, Honua'ula, and Kaumalumalu, to Kahalu'u and Keauhou, in north Kona. By the late 1920s, several other families were becoming well-established in ranching as well. Among these ranches were:

Manuel Gome’s ranch (operating on the lands of Kahului 1-2, and Puapua’a); Frank Gouveia’s ranch (operating on the lands of Puapua’a 1-2 and Hōlualoa); other members of the Gouveia family also ran kula pasturages in Hōlualoa, Pāhoehoe, La‘aloa, Kāpala'alaea, and Kahalu’u. Hu‘ehu’e, another large ranching operation used kula pasturages in Hōlualoa, Kaumalumalu, Kahalu’u, and Keauhou, from around 1934. These later ranching operations ran cattle down to the coastal lands, with pasturages situated just mauka of the current study area, above the present-day Ali‘i Drive. The coastal pasturages were generally used during the rainy season and in preparation for shipping cattle inter-island (cf. Henke 1929 and Kepā Maly—1996 oral history interviews).

Residency in the Laʻaloa Study Area

As noted in the section on the Māhele above, Chiefess Keʻelikōlani received the ahupua’a of La‘aloa-iki as a personal holding in 1852. Following a careful review of the records of the Māhele, only two other claims for land in La‘aloa-iki (1st) were located: one kuleana to Opunui (LCA 10566) is identified on TMK:7-7-08 as being just inland of Hōpoe, or La‘aloa Bay (the area identified in the oral history interview section of this study as being the old Makuakāne-Kalaiwa’a property); and the other, documented by Kalua (LCA 5770), who claimed a cultivated parcel (kīhāpai) in La‘aloa I. The specific location of the parcel was not given in Kalua’s testimony, and does not appear to be recorded on TMK maps.

Consistent with the trend throughout the Hawaiian Islands, many native tenants who resided upon various parcels of land, failed to file claims for personal property—private ownership of land was foreign to the native mind. In addition to the confusion over private property rights, the native population was in rapid decline throughout the 1800s. Thus, while there are historical and/or archaeological records of habitation features, at least one heiau, and burial features, it appears that native residents of La‘aloa either chose not to claim their kuleana, or that they were no longer living in the area when Keʻelikōlani’s award was confirmed.

Land records show that Keʻelikōlani retained La‘aloa 1st until her death in 1883, at which time her land holdings were transferred to her niece, Bernice Pauahi Bishop. Bishop in-turn died in 1884, leaving her husband and associates as executors of her estate. In 1885, the ahupua’a of La‘aloa 1st was sold to Lahapa Kailipeleuli (AKA Lahapa Halsey), who retained the land until 1902, at which time portions of the ahupua’a were being sold. While the Kona Development Company, Ltd., West Hawaii Railroad Company, Ltd., and a number of individuals acquired portions of the ahupua’a, it appears that the earliest site-specific reference to the study area parcel occurs in 1928, when Charles Nāhale purchased the parcel. In August 1938, Nāhale sold the study area parcel to Sydney Lytham, and in September 1938, he sold it to Mrs. Hatsuyo Inaba (cf. Bureau of Conveyances Records in the collection of the Planning Department, County of Hawaii).
It is noted here, that no one contacted in the course of conducting this study had any recollection of a family living on the property, predating Sydney Lytham in 1938 (Walter Eklund, a haole businessman, had a home in the present-day beach park parcel, in the vicinity of the rest rooms). Further documentation on land ownership and use, and area residents is presented in this study, in the oral history interviews with members of: (a) the Inaba family (January 15, 21, and February 3, 1997); (b) the Makuakāne-Kīpapa family (January 22, 1997); and with (c) Valentine K. Ako (January 8-10, 1996).
II. AN OVERVIEW OF HISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES

By the late 1800s and around the turn of the century, a growing number of island residents, Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian alike, were growing concerned about the destruction of traditional Hawaiian sites and the rapid decline of native knowledge about those sites. Heiau (temples) and ceremonial sites were an area of particular interest for several writers around the islands. Thomas Thrum, historian and editor of The Hawaiian Annual compiled a substantial list of heiau and short descriptions of them. A major list of heiau on the island of Hawai‘i, with 32 heiau identified between Puapua’a-Keauhou, was published in 1908. In 1906-1907, John Stokes, an archaeologist from the Bishop Museum, traveled around the island of Hawai‘i, and, with native informants in most all of the localities, visited heiau or sites of former heiau. Though the work was not formally published until 1991 (Stokes and Dye), it was available in manuscript form by 1919 and has served as an important resource for all subsequent archaeological surveys, including that of the current study area.

In 1929-1930, Bishop Museum hired John Reinecke on Hawai‘i to conduct a study of sites in the district of Kona (Reinecke Ms. 1930). Reinecke relied on the work of Thrum and Stokes, and he also met with several elderly native informants and other individuals who were knowledgeable about various sites in the district. In some respects, Reinecke’s work went further than Stokes in that he documented the occurrence of all sites that he came across. Though Reinecke’s work has not been formally published, it has been referenced over the years, and today, it gives us insight into certain sites and features for which no other early information is available.

In the late 1940s, early 1950s, Theodore Kelsey and Henry Kekahuna, both of whom did occasional work with Bishop Museum, and much more work on their own, mapped and recorded sites and histories in Kona. One of their main native guides and informants was an elderly Hawaiian gentleman by the name of Nāluahine Ka‘ōpua (Naluahine); through their efforts, a great resource of information was compiled. Excerpts from the work of Stokes, Reinecke, and Kelsey and Kekahuna are included below, as their combined documentation enriches our understanding of the traditions and cultural resources of the La‘aloa study area.

Adding to the record of formal archaeological studies conducted in the present study area, Marc Smith, Hawai‘i Island Archaeologist with the DLNR-SHPD is preparing a report on findings of a survey conducted in 1995 (cf. Smith et al., in prep). This work will report on and give State Inventory Site Numbers to the sites, and record their condition at the time of the survey, and should be used for monitoring changes in the sites.

“Heiau of the Island of Hawai‘i, A Historic Survey of Native Hawaiian Temple Sites” (Stokes and Dye 1991)

Haukālua Heiau

Bishop Museum Catalogue: 50-Ha-D5-3
State of Hawaii Catalogue: 2009

Heiau of Haukalua, land of La‘aloa, North Kona [Figure 2.]. Located on the north side of the bay, between the sea and the road. This is a low platform or terrace that
rises to a height of four feet at its southwest corner. The northern and eastern sides are level with the ground. The location of the northeast corner is somewhat uncertain. [Thrum adds: “100 by 75 feet, little of which now remains” (1907a:44)- W T. B.] [Stokes and Dye 1991:63-64].

Figure 2. Map of Haukalua Heiau (Stokes and Dye 1991:64).
“Survey of Hawaiian Sites”
(John Reinecke, Ms. 1930)
Reinecke’s 1929-1930 archaeological survey of sites in North Kona was much more intensive than Stokes’ cited above. Reinecke attempted to record all the sites he visited along the coast—heiau, dwellings, trails, walls, burials, etc. Because the work remains incomplete, and because Reinecke and everyone that assisted him have since passed away, the exact locations of many of the sites he described will never be known. Using the 1928 USGS Quad maps (Figure 3.), Reinecke marked the general locations of the sites he recorded, but because of scale problems, the actual locations could be several hundreds of feet off. Pertinent excerpts from Reinecke’s manuscript are included here, as they provide informant information that is no longer available through other sources.

Under the heading “Sites From Kapalaalaea To Lanihau,” Reinecke recorded some general information about the cultural landscape at the time, and made specific references to the following sites in La’aloa:

The most distinctive feature of this section is the use of coral fragments as a top dressing for the floors of dwelling sites. This is as characteristic as the use of iliili in the a-a section of Kahaluu.

A very large proportion of the dwelling sites and other structures along this coast must have been erected mauka of the government beach road; but it is practically impossible to penetrate the undergrowth to investigate even as far mauka as the Pa Kuakini; where I did so, the results were disappointing, as grazing of cattle and the demands of Kuleana walls have resulted in the destruction of many sites. Furthermore, this coast was rather densely populated until recently, so that most dwelling sites will be recent and of little interest [Reinecke ms. 1930:52].

In La’aloa, Reinecke recorded several sites (see below), though only one, Site 15, the heiau “Haukaloa,” old house sites, pens, and a pit, “probably once a well,” appear to be within the present study area. Reinecke’s La’aloa and neighboring Pāhoehoe sites include:

Site 11. Remains on the point (___) at the south side of Laaloa Bay [the Kanewa Makuakāne lot; now Kona Onenalö]. These include several recent puoa [a built-up stone burial feature] a wall cutting off the most elevated part of the point, on which are two old dwelling sits on a walled-up yard platform; a canoe landing; and, next the road, a modern house platform and cistern [see also interview notes with Makuakāne family members in this study].

Site 12. A doubtful house site...

Site 15. HAUKALOA [Haukālua] HEIAU, in Laaloa (?). . . A simple platform which, in its broken-down condition, slants sharply makai; was probably built in two levels; is about 4’ high in front. At the south end it appears to have been in two terraces. There is a house site on the S.E. corner. the approximate length is 8-87 or 95’; the width cannot be stated even approximately, as the platform runs into the bank, but may have been about 56’. South of it are a small old house site followed by a larger one. North are two or three old house sites
Figure 3. Copy of a Portion of Reinecke's North Kona Site Map (c. 1930).
before reaching a pen, which contains a smaller pen and a shallow pit, probably once a well.

Site 16. A modern house site mauka of Haukaloa; also, an old, large house site near the gate of the same kuleana.

Site 17. Masonry and a-a remains of two large and one small house sites.

Site 19. A pen with walls on all but the mauka side, c. 13’ thick and 4’ high--a very interesting and puzzling ruin, probably small heiau [written by hand]. This is followed by two modern house sites; an old house site and a well 6’ in diameter and 2’ deep; and by many heaps of rocks which probably obscure several sites...

Site 21. Remains of a small platform on a slight headland. A good location for a fishing heiau. [Reinecke ms. 1930:53-54]

### Kona in the Late 1940s - Early 1950s: Recorded by Henry Kekahuna and Theodore Kelsey

While reviewing records at the Hawai‘i State Archives, the author collected information from the files of Theodore Kelsey and Henry Kekahuna (Archives file record M-445). Theodore Kelsey (Papa Kelsey) was a Hawaiian historian, researcher, translator, and author, who spent most of the years of his life (1891-1987), speaking with elderly Hawaiian people, collecting their stories, and translating their writings. He collaborated with Henry Kekahuna, a native historian on several projects, and cared for Kekahuna in the latter years of his life. Kekahuna was a skilled cartographer who produced and left to future generations a valuable record—annotated drawings of cultural sites in Kona.

Portions of the Kekahuna and Kelsey collections are found in the Hawai‘i State Archives, at Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, and in the collection of June Gutmanis, curator of the Kelsey Collection. The extensive references include both handwritten and typed sheets, ranging from single-page entries to multiple-page manuscripts. One of the most significant aspects of Kelsey and Kekahuna’s work in North Kona, was that they took the time to record the histories as remembered by several aged natives, among whom was Mr. Nāluahine Ka‘ōpua (“Nāluahine”), a native resident of the Kahalu‘u area, descended from the line of La-na‘i, who was reportedly, the last formal priest of Ka-pua-noni Heiau. The author listened to a series of interviews with Nāluahine (c. 1959) from the collection of the Bishop Museum (Catalogue: Haw 66.3.1, 66.3.2; Haw 66.4; and 66.5.1). While the recordings are of varying quality, Nāluahine’s own words confirm many of the stories and place name accounts, cited below, recorded by Kelsey and Kekahuna.

The following narratives collected by Kelsey and Kekahuna from Nāluahine, include descriptions for sites and resources of coastal La‘aloa. Because of the impacts of development over the last 40 years, their record of such sites is all that remains. It should be noted that the excerpts cited below, are but a small portion of the rich texts recorded by Kelsey and Kekahuna. Anyone interested in the history of Kona should review their varied collections.
Selected Excerpts from Interviews with Nāluahine Kaʻōpua

[T. Kelsey: written by hand]

Lehu-kapu, a spring, from which Pahoehoe and Laaloa obtained water. (Komo ka wai o Pahoehoe me Laa-loa.) Laa-loa I. The ‘awa bowl of Kāne. (Kāne and Kana-loa were twin demi-gods, bearing the names of major deities.) Kānoa ‘Awa a Kāne, on the right. It is a large stone by the road. (Some iron rails are laid over a slight depression in the road near here). There is a house on the upland side.

[hand written notes; nd.] Pahoehoe I — Spring name Moku-loulu. Lae o ka huihui [noted not “hu’ihu’i”], at the south of the sand beach. Lehu-kapu komo paha iloko o ke one o Pahoehoe [Lehu-kapu spring perhaps enters in the sands of Pāhoehoe].

La’a-loa, the cove is known as Hopoe. Huihui is on the boundary of Pahoehoe and La’a-loa. Ka wai-a-Kane spring at the seashore on the northwest of the present house now standing there. Ka lae o Ke-pe’a [the point of Ke-pe’a] at the west of Kawai-a-Kane [map drawn with notes — Figure 4.].

Huihui (not Hu’ihu’i), a patch of sand (Kīpuka one). The name is also given to the cove here.

La’a-loa, a large land. There is a spring at the shore here named Wai a Kāne. Demi-god Kāne’s bowl for drinking ‘awa portions is in upland La’a-loa on the upper side of the road, near one or more residences, where some iron rails are laid, (I think; Kel.). The water of Kāne’s spring was used to clear his ‘awa (hoka i ka ‘awa). When a menstruating woman went to bathe in Kāne’s water upland it dried up and reappeared at the shore. The place upland, where Ke Kānoa ‘Awa o Kāne (Kāne’s ‘Awa Bowl) is was very tabu. There was water there for preparing the ‘awa drink. There is a pahoehoe flat (papa pahoehoe) and a high mound there, hollowed for the drinking of Kāne’s ‘awa. (Ua hana poho ‘ia i wahi e inu ai ka ‘awa o Kāne.)


Among their notes of Kona sites, was the pre-final draft of an article that was later published in the Hawaii Tribune-Herald. In closing the article series, Kelsey and Kekahuna offered the following words of advise and caution.

...We hope that the people will cherish the things that should be preserved for themselves and for posterity—things which they now deliberately destroy or allow to perish, but for which in a very few years from now we shall be clamoring.

Perhaps people will be inspired to roam the country and preserve for posterity our treasures of antiquity. They may become in [the] future a greatest source of revenue.
for our government. Let us awaken now, and not later, lest our precious remnants of the past be lost forever [Kelsey and Kekahuna, Ms., c. 1950:41].

Based on the interviews collected as a part of this study (reported in the following section), in which recommendations were made to protect and care for the cultural resources of La’aloa, and to provide opportunities for people to learn about the history of the land, we see that the insight of Kelsey and Kekahuna nearly 50 years ago, rings true today, with an even greater urgency.

Figure 4. Rough Sketch Map of La’aloa Bay (Kelsey and Kekahuna with Nāluahine, c. 1950).
III. LA‘ALOA INTERVIEWS AND CONSULTATION  
(JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1997)

Interview and Consultation Methodology

This section of the study presents readers with the records of both oral history interviews and consultations conducted in an effort to gather legendary and historical narratives from knowledgeable individuals, familiar with the lands, cultural resources, subsistence practices, and families of the La‘aloa area of North Kona. The goal being to elicit treatment recommendations, and ensure that culturally responsible consideration be given in the development of the site preservation plan for the La‘aloa study area. In this study, the term “oral history interview” applies to documentation recorded by individuals who have knowledge of the study area based on their life experiences, or who possess knowledge of customs and practices associated with near-by areas. For the purposes of this study, the term “consultation” is used to identify records collected through discussions with individuals who have expressed concern for the area, or have experience dealing with historic preservation issues in the region. The consultation records in this study includes two primary information sources: (1) consultation with community members (though not necessarily individuals who have familial ties to families of the ahupua‘a of La‘aloa); and (2) consultation with government agency employees.

While trying to seek out potential interviewees, the author spoke with Aunty Lily Namakaokai‘a Ha‘anio-Kong; Leimana Damate of the Kona Hawaiian Civic Club; and Ruby Keana‘aina-McDonald of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. Several criteria were used in trying to identify potential interviewees, among them were:

a. The potential interviewee’s genealogical ties to lands of the study area (i.e., descent from families awarded land in the Māhele of 1848, or descended from recipients of Land Grants from the Kingdom or Territory of Hawai‘i);

b. Age—the older the informant, the more likely the individual is to have had personal communications or first-hand experiences with even older, now deceased Hawaiians; and

c. An individual’s identity in the community as being someone possessing specific knowledge of lore or historical wisdom pertaining to the lands, families, practices, and land use activities in the study area.

The primary focus of the interviews and consultation was to: (a) elicit traditional information (i.e. knowledge handed down in families from generation to generation); (b) to document traditional values and practices that are still retained in the lives of Hawaiian families associated with the lands of the study area; and (c) when possible, also to document specific site preservation recommendations. The interviews were also to seek out information on other sites or features identified by the interviewees as being associated with families and cultural practices, and to collect information so as to identify community recommendations for cultural site preservation in conjunction with the proposed expansion of La‘aloa Beach Park.
Figure 5

Showing Areas and/or Recommendations Discussed in Interviews.
Between January 14 to February 3, 1997, thirteen individuals participated in nine interviews as a part of this study. The study also includes excerpts from 2 formal oral history interviews with six individuals, collected by the author in 1996. Those earlier interview excerpts are included in this document because they provide readers with historical narratives of the La'aloa study area.

Participants in the oral history interviews included Lily M.N. Ha'anio-Kong, James and Goro Inaba, members of the Makuakāne family, Valentine K. Ako, and Kalaniola Hamm and family. Community members who participated in consultation discussions included Kahu Leon Sterling, Alena Kaiokekoa and Kawelu, and Zachary Kapule. While Ruby Keanaaina McDonald of OHA and a member of the HIBC, and Marc Smith of DLNR-SHPD, participated in consultation discussions as a part of this study. During the interviews and discussions, as specific sites were discussed, the County’s La'aloa Park Map (L 7718) was referred to, and when possible, site locations were indicated on the interview map. A compilation of those locations is presented on Figure 5.

Based on the previous experiences of the author, a list of basic questions was developed (Figure 6). As various potential interviewees were contacted, they were told about the nature of the study, and asked if they had knowledge of traditional sites or practices associated with the study area, and if they would be willing to share some of their knowledge. Each of the individuals who participated in the interviews and consultation were given draft copies of the expanded notes that summarized their recollections and recommendations in this matter. They were asked to review the notes and comment on their accuracy and content. Following a review and incorporation of any corrections, additions, or modifications that were made to the draft notes, the individuals gave their verbal permission for use of the expanded notes in this study.
La‘aloa Beach Park – Site Preservation Plan
General Question Outline

The following questions are meant to provide a basic format for the informal oral history interviews. The interviewee’s personal knowledge and experiences will provide direction for the formulation of other detailed questions, determine the need for site visits, and/or other forms of documentation which may be necessary.

Name: ____________________ Address: ______________________________

Age: ____________________ ______________________________

Parents: _________________ Phone: ______________________________

Where born: ______________

How became familiar with La‘aloa:

Recollections of La‘aloa:

1 - Families:

2 - Practices / Resources Collected:

3 - Sites (Heiau, Kū‘ula, Burials etc.):

Comments on County Plans for Park and Parking Expansion:

How to Protect Sites:

1 - Treatment: “as-is” — “restoration” etc.:

2 - Preservation Buffer Zones
   (short-term, long-term, and size/configuration):

3 - Interpretation and Access:

4 - Community Participation:

5 - Maintenance:

Figure 6. La‘aloa County Park – Site Preservation Plan: General Question Outline.
Overview of Information Gathered as a Result of Interviews and Consultation

The following Tables (Table 2-a & 2-b.) provide readers with an overview of several key recommendations made during the interviews (see also Section IV and Table 3., for further documentation of preservation plan components). The full expanded interview notes (also in this section of the study) provide readers with further details, and place the comments and recommendations in the general context of the discussions.

Table 2-a. General And Interim (Short-term) Preservation Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Recommendation</th>
<th>Participant(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to finalization of Park plans, a meeting should be held between the County and interested parties to discuss and finalize preservation and management treatments.</td>
<td>LS, AK, ZK (LO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim (Short-Term) Preservation Recommendations</th>
<th>Participant(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No heavy equipment should be used makai of the old Government Road easement--proposed parking area.</td>
<td>LS, AK, LK-LM-LT-D/LK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The boundary between the parking lot and remainder of the park should be clearly marked with construction fencing to ensure that no equipment go into the preservation area.</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the old Inaba house foundation is removed, work should be monitored by an archaeologist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All work involving heavy equipment should be monitored, with particular care given to ensure that vibrations from ground movement do not cause rocks to fall from the heiau.</td>
<td>LS, AK, LK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the rocks from the preservation area should be taken for park construction purposes.</td>
<td>LK, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All rocks from the vicinity of the parking lot, broken during construction should remain on the property, and could be used to help establish the buffer between the public area and the preservation area.</td>
<td>LK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearing of any brush should be done by hand, with trees cut to the ground and appropriate chemical treatment to ensure that no new, undesirable growth will occur.</td>
<td>Standard Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviation Key**

Italics indicate Oral History Interview Participants: LK=Lily Ha’anio-Kong; LM=Lawrence Makuakāne; LT=Luciana Makuakāne-Tripp; D/LK=Daniel and Lucy Kailiwai; Consultation Participants: LS=Leon Sterling; AK=Alena Kaloakekoa (with Kawelu); RM=Ruby McDonald; ZK (LO)=Zachary Kapule (with La’aloa ‘Ohana)
### Table 2-b. Long-term Preservation Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Preservation Recommendations</th>
<th>Participant(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The heiau and other cultural sites should be stabilized and preserved as is, to retain what remains of the work of the kūpuna.</td>
<td>LK-LM-LT-D/LK, LS, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single preservation buffer should be delineated around the Haukālua Heiau, burials, and cultural sites to the south of the heiau. The buffer should begin at the makai boundary of the old Government Road, extending from an area about 20 to 30 feet north of the heiau to Hōpoe Bay on the south of the heiau.</td>
<td>LK-LM-LT-D/LK, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the preservation area should be limited to those with cultural affiliation to the heiau and cultural resources, or be guided by individuals knowledgeable about the area resources.</td>
<td>LK-LM-LT-D/LK, LS, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The known burial remains will be protected in place, and any remains that may be identified in the future, will be treated on a case-by-case basis in conformance with Chapter 6E-43 (as amended by Act 306) and other applicable Hawaii State Laws.</td>
<td>LK-LM-LT-D/LK, LS, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stewardship group should be acknowledged, and share responsibility for long-term preservation of the resources.</td>
<td>LK-LM-LT-D/LK, LS, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stones should not be taken from the preservation area for any other uses.</td>
<td>LK-LM-LT-D/LK, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive signs should be placed in areas outside of the preservation buffer so that they may be seen, and yet, not impact the view planes.</td>
<td>RM, LK-LM-LT, D/LK, LS, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All funerary remains should be preserved in place.</td>
<td>RM, LK-LM-LT, D/LK, LS, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kū’ula (fishing god stone), should be relocated to an area overlooking the ocean, and set on a small kahua (platform) covered with ‘ili‘ili (water worn pebbles).*</td>
<td>LK-LM-LT-D/LK, LS, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ancient spring should be reopened and restored.</td>
<td>LK-LM-LT-D/LK, ZK (LO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buffer between the parking area and the preservation site could be made from stones taken from area of parking lot, and lot surface should be of a material more aesthetically pleasing than asphalt.</td>
<td>LK-LM-LT-D/LK, ZK (LO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The natural lay of the land should be left basically as it is in the park, use the natural topography in the landscaping, with filling in appropriated areas.</td>
<td>LK-LM-LT-D/LK, ZK (LO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make a hālau for cultural and educational purposes.</td>
<td>LS, ZK (LO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make an ethnobotanical garden in the preservation area.</td>
<td>ZK (LO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with community members in developing long-term commitments for preservation.</td>
<td>LK, LS, AK ZK (LO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t make the proposed parking lot in the area presently being considered. Instead, dedicate the entire property to a cultural preserve, and make new parking along the edge of Ali‘i Drive.</td>
<td>ZK (LO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Abbreviation Key

Italics indicate Oral History Interview Participants: LK=Lily Ha’anio-Kong; LM=Lawrence Makuakāne; LT=Luciana Makuakāne-Tripp; D/LK=Daniel and Lucy Kailiwal; Consultation Participants: LS=Leon Sterling; AK=Alena Kaiokekoa (with Kawelu); RM=Ruby McDonald; ZK (LO)=Zachary Kapule (with La’aloa ‘Ohana).

* Aunty Lily asks, County and group concur that another stone presently between the volley ball court and parking area is to be treated in a similar manner (see Appendix A).
La‘aloa Interview and Consultation Records

This section of the study includes the complete, released interview and consultation records. The oral historical component of the study is presented first, followed by the two levels of consultation records.

Oral History Interviews

Lily Namakaokai'a Ha'anio-Kong

Meetings—January 14, 15, & 23, 1997

(and previous oral history interview excerpts)

Aunty Lily was born in 1927, and is a life-long resident of Keauhou, Kona with family ties to the land of La‘aloa. She has been an active proponent of programs that interpret and protect Hawaiian cultural sites, natural resources, and practices. Aunty is an avid fisherwoman, and until recently, has regularly fished along the shoreline fronting the La‘aloa study area, and as a result of those excursions, also remembers the heiau Haukālua. Aunty Lily offered the following general comments and recommendations regarding development of the preservation plan for the La‘aloa sites:

1 - Preservation of the heiau, burials, and other resources is very important to our kūpuna and future generations.

2 - The heiau should be preserved as stabilized ruins. What’s left, I think it should be preserved and kept as it is, because if we don’t, or we try to restore, then you loose the history, like I said, ‘There’s no story to talk about,’ you know. When you “restore,” you rewrite the whole thing. You know, every rock was blessed when it was set down, it was because it was for the ali‘i [royalty]. . . This is the way I feel about preservation; we need to preserve what’s left, not restore or remake it. Everything should be preserved that way. Then you know, you have some history of the old Hawai‘i. Otherwise it’s lost forever. Aunty Lily urges, “Waiho mālie” (leave it at peace, leave it be).

Aunty observed that recently, in the last six to nine months, the heiau has been changed, it has been “reconstructed,” it is all different. From days when she used to fish along the shore of La‘aloa, Aunty remembers that the heiau was made primarily of the water worn, rounded stones, like other heiau along the Kona shore line, and that the stacked rock remnants of the makai walls of the heiau were visible from the shore. The recent “reconstruction” with coral and other features does not resemble the heiau as it is in her memory. Hopefully, we can work to reach a balance in this matter of what the heiau should look like and how to care for it for the long-term.

Aunty suggests that the coral rocks that have been recently placed on the heiau be removed. The heiau never looked as it does now (see also notes from a La‘aloa site visit with members of the Makuakāne and Kailiwai families, and Aunty Lily Kong; January 22, 1997).

3 - One of the important ways to help protect the heiau and burial places at La‘aloa, will be to make some signs that will tell people about our culture and why these places are sacred to us, If people know, they will be more likely to respect our history. Signs should be set out side protective buffer areas.
4 - It is also important that there be a protective buffer between the cultural sites and the general area of the park. This buffer should be made by planting native plants around sites, while leaving enough room for those who want to visit the sites, to be able to get close and pay their respects.

Aunty suggests that the stones that are removed from the outcrops in the parking lot, be used to make the makai curbstone boundary between the preservation sites and the general public access and parking area. No stones should be removed from the shoreward sites and preservation area.

5 - Aunty also remembers that there was a Kūʻula (stone fishing god) that was set near the Laʻaloa cove. When the Kūʻula was relocated and set up about three years ago, the schools of fish returned to Laʻaloa, they were more plentiful than when the Kūʻula was missing. Now—since about a year and a half ago—the Kūʻula is no longer standing up (see interview comments with Zachary Kapule), and the fishing is not as good (this account is also recorded by Aunty Luciana Makuakāne-Tripp and Aunty Makaleka Kahulamū-Alapaʻi).

[see also notes from a La'aloa site visit with members of the Makuakāne and Kailiwai families, and Aunty Lily Kong; January 22, 1997.]

6 - Aunty suggests that we go speak with Aunty Luciana Makuakāne-Tripp, and she will also go with me to speak with the guys who are staying down at the park (see notes from a La'aloa site visit with members of the Makuakāne and Kailiwai families, and Aunty Lily Kong; January 22, 1997).

7 - The County should work out an agreement with the Hawaiian boys that are down at Laʻaloa, to make a hālau (long-house) type of structure. The boys could gather the ʻōhiʻa logs and materials that would be needed for the structure. (Notes reviewed and released on January 28, 1997)

Goro Inaba (Telephone Conversation—January 15, 1997)

The Inaba family purchased the Laʻaloa beach property in 1938 (sold to the County of Hawai‘i in 1995). Goro notes that portions of the property had been previously cleared, and that in all the years that they had the property and house, he mostly went down for weekends only. Goro has no recollection of any heiau, Kūʻula, people going to gather lau-hala, or specific families going fishing. He notes that in the first years they had the property, Sydney Lytham (1878-1947), lived on the property as a caretaker (see also, interview excerpts from Val K. Ako).

Mr. Inaba noted that over the years they had cleared only portions of the property of vegetation a few times, and he does not recall ever seeing any burial remains or hearing of remains being situated on the property. The only Hawaiian artifact that he recalls having seen was a stone kōnane (checker) board near the canoe landing on the south side of the property, but that was stolen years ago. That’s basically the extent of his recollections. He has no site preservation recommendations, as he is unfamiliar with the nature of the sites on the property.
James Inaba  
Telephone Conversation—January 21, 1997,  
Site Visit—February 3, 1997, and Meeting January 20, 1997  
Having mentioned that I had spoken with Goro Inaba, Aunty Lily Kong suggested that a call be made to Jimmy Inaba as well. She recalled that he had lived on the La'aloa property, and in the subsequent telephone conversation and site visit, this was confirmed. In the discussions, information about the condition of the property, its uses, and location of various structures which residents, Sydney Lytham or members of the Inaba family had built, was brought to light. This information is of historic value, and helps us document certain historic features and modifications to the land, and is included here. The following notes, and site map (Figure 5.), record key points of the conversations and site visit. A draft of the notes were forwarded to Mr. Inaba and reviewed. A few small corrections were made, and additional information given, and the notes were released for use in this study on February 20, 1997.  

Interview and Site Records Documentation:  
After the Inaba family acquired the property from Sydney Lytham in 1938, the family generally only spent some weekends or holidays at the beach, and also let out the house for others who wanted to have a party or some function there. Between 1958-1970 it was the permanent residence of Jimmy Inaba and his family. In the nearly 60 years, that the family owned the property, no one ever knew of any heiau, burials, or other Hawaiian sites there. It was observed that portions of the property had been previously cleared, like the section of the old Government Road, and some of the hau brush and kiawe were periodically cleared by hand, by the family as well.  

It was suggested in these conversations, since no one recalled seeing, or being told of any formal walls or platforms in the vicinity of the identified heiau or stone platform, that perhaps over the years, high surf had ruined most of the features that may have been on the lot. On February 20th, Mr. Inaba was shown some pictures of the heiau site as it was in April 1995, he then noted, “I’d seen those stones piled like that, but never recognized them as being set in a particular form.”  

1 - Prior to Sydney Lytham’s (Sid) acquiring the study area lot in 1938, he had lived on the Walter Eklund lot, in the house that was in the vicinity of the present day La'aloa Beach Park rest rooms; W. Eklund had been the manager of Von Hamm Young in Hilo, and the old house was his beach home. When Sid purchased the study area lot, he built a small house on a concrete slab, that was roughly 20’x14’, with a little kitchen and living area. Sid’s original foundation can still be seen (the cement colors and textures vary) in the larger slab that still remains on the lot at the time of this writing.  

By the early 1940s, Sid and Jimmy Inaba had built two entry columns at the southern entrance to the lot, situated basically where the then, new road cut off the old Government Road. The two columns were made with 450 beer bottles cemented together, and topped with one large five-gallon glass jar. The old driveway basically followed the old Government Road remnant up to the house, with cars parking on the mauka side of the house. Eventually, the beer bottle entryway had to be removed, because some people were throwing rocks at it, breaking the glass.
2 - While no one in the family had ever heard of, or seen a heiau, burials, or other Hawaiian sites, it was recalled that on the southwest, shoreward side of the property, there was an area with a thick growth of hau, and also a lot of kiawe and opiuma growth in the area now identified as the heiau. (Mr. Inaba recalls that the opiuma was used medicinally for stomach ailments.) The areas where the trees and hau grew were pretty much left alone, and even when fishing on the shore, between the house and the small bay to the south, no one ventured into the thickets.

It is recalled, that except for (a) where the house was situated; (b) where the water tank and cesspool were; (c) where the furo was built; and (d) clearing the vegetation from in front of the house out to the shore, the family never touched most of the property, and never brought a bulldozer in to do any clearing. All brush clearing in their time was done by hand (see Figure 5.).

On the south (Kahalu'u) side of the lot, in the little cove, there was an old canoe landing where Minoru Inaba (now 92) kept a canoe. They regularly went out to the 'ōpelu ko'a ('ōpelu fishing site) in front of La'aloa, and also paddled all the way out to Kāināliu to a spot where they caught Kona crabs.

3 - Shortly after the Inaba family purchased the lot, they made a small furo house. The furo was on the north side of the lot, makai of the house, a short distance away from the present-day park rest rooms. The furo was built along side a small natural brackish water pond<sup>3</sup>. The cement foundation from the furo house is still visible.

Immediately on the north side of the pond, was the old wall that divided the Inaba property from that of Walter Eklund. Portions of that division wall may still be seen today, underneath the hau growth.

4 - Jimmy recalls that several families lived in the vicinity of the present-day park, the Kukahikos had the property that the Makuakane and Kāne families lived on. Another member of the Makuakane family and later Ale Kālaiwa'a lived in front of La'aaloa Bay, and John Keana'aina and family lived a little further north. There were not too many other people that came around the area in the early years. Jimmy does not recall any other families going to fish, gather lau hala or other resources in the area, and he had never heard that there were old Hawaiian sites on the property. John Keana'aina had told Jimmy Inaba about the heiau that is situated across the street from the "Magic Sands Condo," next to the present-day, old twostory house.

As mentioned by Goro Inaba, there had been a kōnane board found on the lot. The board was found on the southern side of the lot, in the vicinity of what is now identified as a stone platform (Figure 5.). The kōnane board was later stolen.

5 - In 1958, the house was remodeled by Jimmy Inaba. Sid's original slab was add onto, with a patio in the front (ocean side), and two bedrooms and a bathroom added on the south side of the house. Jimmy Inaba, his wife and daughter lived in the house for about 12 years.

---

<sup>3</sup> For a brief historic discussion on springs of the La'aaloa-Pāhoehoe coastal vicinity, see the section above citing records from Nāluahine Ka’ōpua, collected by H. Kekahuna and T. Kelsey.
6 - It was suggested that the former house foundation could be used to make a small park pavilion. It was also suggested that it would be nice to have some beach cabanas built for public use. Perhaps the County might seek out public contributions for construction of the cabanas, identifying each cabana by the name(s) of the individuals who donated to their construction. Mr. Inaba believes that the park is an important community resource, and the improvements will benefit residents and visitors alike. He also observed, “Careful development of the park will also help people enjoy the significance of the historical sites in the area.”

Lolina (Lawrence) Makuakāne, Luciana Ka'ailehua⁴ Makuakāne-Tripp, Daniel and Lucy (Makuakāne) Kailiwai⁵, and Lily Namakaokaiʻa Haʻanio-Kong
Laʻaloa Site Visit—January 22, 1997
Following discussions with Aunty Lily Kong, she suggested that I speak with Aunty Luciana Makuakāne-Tripp, and that we three could go to Laʻaloa together to look at the heiau and sites, and to speak with the “boys” down there. Like Aunty Lily, Aunty Luciana had participated in an oral history interview with me last year, during which time we had some brief discussion about the Kūʻula of Laʻaloa-Pāhohoe. The Makuakāne line is descended from the Kīpapa-Kekapahaukea line that had ancestral lands in the ahupuaʻa of Pāhohoe, and earlier this century, a branch of the family also lived in Laʻaloa-iki.

Prior to our meeting of January 22nd, Aunty Lily went to visit Uncle Danny and Aunty Lucy (Makuakāne) Kailiwai, and to our good fortune, the elder, Uncle Lolina Makuakāne and his wife were home in Kona, visiting from Honolulu. This branch of the Makuakāne family are first cousins of Aunty Luciana (the ages of these family members range from 65 to 70 years old). Uncle Lolina and his family lived on the shore of Laʻaloa-iki, on the south side of the little cove that bounds the present study area. From their home (cited as the “Kāne home” by James Inaba above), the Makuakāne children traveled the shore line fronting Laʻaloa-iki (including the beach park).

The narratives below record in summary form, some of the historic recollections and recommendations of this group of kūpuna. They all expressed how happy they were to be able to come back and walk across the land so many years later. It brought many memories back to them, and they are encouraged by the efforts to gather some of the history of the land and share the stories with the young people and visitors.

The sites discussed, are recorded from south to north, beginning at the Makuakāne homestead on the southern side of Laʻaloa-iki up to the shore fronting the Kīpapa’s land in Pāhohoe on the north.

1 - It was around 1934 that Lucy Leleiwī⁶-Makuakāne and her children moved to the Laʻaloa-iki property (presently the “Kona Onenalo” condo). Uncle Lolina

---

⁴ Aunty Luciana’s Hawaiian name, Ka’ailehua, given to her by her kūpuna, is also the name of an ‘ilii of land in the family’s native land of Laʻaloa.
⁵ Mr. Daniel Kaʻiliwai passed away in July 1997.
⁶ Lele-iwi: In a legendary account collected by Charles Bishop in the c. 1880s, this family name, Leleiwī, was also identified as the name of a heiau in the land of Laʻaloa, home of the priest Hāwaʻe. Leleiwī was also the name of a Laʻaloa resident, who during the Māhele, testified on behalf of claimants for kuleana in Laʻaloa.
was about seven years old. He recalls that Charles Nāhale worked out a trade with Mrs. Makuakāne, giving them the La'aloa-iki property. Nuhi Kāne, was a son-in-law of Mrs. Makuakāne’s, and lived on the property with the family as well. The ancient paena wa’a (canoe landing) which they also used, can still be seen on the north facing shore of the little cove, looking right across to the park (see site records of Reinecke cited above). The papa (shelf) of pāhoehoe is worn smooth, almost concave from years of use (presently an opening in the naupaka growth marks the landing). In the water, on the ocean side of the landing, is a shallow papa that breaks the waves, causing the landing area to be calm. And the landing itself, in front of the canoe hauling papa, is quite deep. Uncle Lolina fondly remembers how they would count the waves, and glide into the protected landing, and then une, or quickly push the paddles into the water to turn the canoe around and haul it out.

At another little inlet just ocean-ward of the landing (presently marked by the second to the last coconut tree on the condo property) was where their water hole was. This water hole was the primary source of the family’s drinking water. The water was always sweet, not salty like some of the water holes that were even farther inland. When asked, no one had heard the name Kawai-a-Kāne, as recorded by Tūtū Nāluahine (see Figure 4.).

While pointing out the coconut tree marker for the water hole, Uncle mā observed that in their young days, there were no coconut trees in the vicinity, and that there had never been grass all over the shore line like now. Except for the pockets of soil in the pāhoehoe flows, everything else was pretty much rocky. The families used to dry fish and clothes on the rock outcroppings. Uncle Lolina also recalled that at the back (mauka side) of the house, there used to be a little grave yard. He remembers that when he asked his mother who the people were, she did not know, but commented that they must have been old people from that land (see site records of Reinecke cited above). Uncle does not know what happened to the graves after Carlsmith got the property.

2 - In the mid section of the little cove (State property — TMK:7-7-10,35), situated on the water, fronting the 1920s residence Kamanawa Makuakāne and his wife Mary Ann (later, Mrs. Ale Kālaiwa’a), there was another canoe landing. Before, in the 1920s-1930s, there always used to be sand in the little cove, the rocks weren’t exposed like today. Behind that canoe landing, mid way up to the house, there was also a little pond or brackish water well.

3 - Standing at the stone platform (possibly a kahua hale or house site), at the southern edge of the park extension, the family members recalled that there was an old canoe landing, but that in their time, no one lived on that side of the property, and the landing wasn’t used regularly.

4 - The family members all remember Sid Lytham, and commented on how beautiful the beer bottle entry columns were that he had made into his house, overlooking La’aloa Bay. In their younger days, the old Kailua-Keauhou Road

---

7 Mā — the Hawaiian word “mā,” used here and in other sections of this study, means “and folks, companions,” or “others.” Like “Aunty them,” or “Uncle Folks.”
was still in use, and they walked through the study area property everyday, going to Kailua School.

5 - The entire shoreline, between their La’a’ala-iki home and Pāhoehoe, was the Makuakāne children’s playground and fishing ground, they traveled throughout the area. All of the family members observed that in their youth, they never heard their parents or elders speak about the heiau there.

When asked if they might have heard the name Haukalua, all shook their heads, “no.” Uncle Lolina noted, “There is a lot of hau growing their now, but in our day, the hau did not come over this far.” The hau was down towards the beach on the other side. Also, the family members didn’t recall seeing identifiable walls or platforms in their time, noting that the waves sometimes came up and washed over the area. They were surprised to hear that early archaeologists (1906-1907 and 1930) had identified the heiau, and that State archaeologist, Marc Smith had indeed seen structural evidence under the wave washed rubble.

Everyone was quite surprised to see the present-day structure with all the white coral cobbles lined around, noting that they had never seen anything like it at La’a’aloa, or anywhere else in Hawai‘i. Uncle Lolina said, “It never looked like this here, all the time we go through this place, there was no such thing like this.”

Uncle Danny said:

Before these old places are changed, the people need to remember to be respectful. They got to go talk to the old people who lived on the land. If not, people can get in trouble.

6 - The group agreed among themselves that it was very important to protect the burial sites, and that in most cases, the iwi had been put in the ground at a particular place, because the land was special to that individual. Aunty Luciana observed:

No move the burials, take care of them where they are. That’s where they’ve been for many years, that’s where they belong.

Uncle Danny noted:

My grandmother told me that we are not supposed to touch the burials, that they should not be moved. If there are graves in the heiau area, that’s where old people put them, who are we to say “No.”?

7 - Standing on the old Inaba house foundation, looking around the property towards the heiau and below towards the present beach park, both uncles Lolina and Danny suggested that no bulldozing occur below the old government road. It was also suggested that the natural contours of the land be used, filling could be done in areas to provide level spots, but the land should not be totally flattened.

8 - Uncle Lolina noted that the Kona White Sands condo driveway sat on the old La’a’aloa-iki-Pāhoehoe mauka-makai trail.
In the next lot to the north, Uncle Lolina recalled that his father had built a wall that enclosed a large garden, in which they planted pala'ai (pumpkins) and 'uala (sweet potatoes). The pala'ai was eaten, and was also used for palu (bait) to chum the 'ōpelu.

9 - Upon reaching the present-day beach park, we met with Zachary Kapule and some of his friends, several were related to the Makuakāne and Kailiwai families. Uncle Lolina also remembered that there used to be a small pond in the vicinity of the present-day rest rooms. When asked, no one remembered hearing a name for the spring (Lehu-kapu, as recorded by Tūtū Nāluahine), but it was felt that it was important to clean the area around the former spring. Zachary observed that you can still hear water underground in the lava tube system, though the recent road work seems to have collapsed the tunnels some, because the flow isn’t as noticeable.

10 - Upon going to look at the Kū'ula, Aunty Luciana and Aunty Lily both confirmed that the stone, which is now laying down, was the Kū'ula that they knew of. Earlier in the afternoon, when speaking with Aunty Luciana about the Kū'ula, I mentioned to her that Tūtū Nāluahine had told Henry Kekahuna that the La'aloa Bay was named Höpoe (see excerpts above in this study). Aunty Luciana said she had heard that name, and thought that Höpoe may also have been the name of the Kū'ula itself.

Aunty Luciana and Aunty Lily commented on how plentiful the fish had become when the Kū'ula had been set upright. Though Aunty Luciana observed that these old stones had been given mana, and that today, if people mess around with 'um, and don’t respect it all the way, it can come back and bite them. You can’t feed it some times and then forget to feed it other times.

Everyone was happy to see the Kū'ula stone, but noted that it was not in its original position (it’s now laying behind the lifeguard stand), before it used to be close to the water where, as Aunty Lily said, “it could be washed by the sea spray.” Zachary explained that because the park retaining wall had been built, the Kū'ula had been moved, and when the ‘Ohana had tried to set it up again, representatives from the County told them to put it down because it might fall on someone.

The group agreed that the Kū'ula should be set up in such a way—perhaps on a small kahua (platform), or surrounded by a small pā (wall)—so that it could once again look out to the ocean. A possible area was pointed out, on a high rock outcrop, about 15 feet south of where it is presently. Aunty Lily suggests that a kahua be made to support the base of the Kū'ula, and the 'ili'ili be used to pave the surface of the kahua, and to help cushion the Kū'ula.

11 - Everyone was very happy that the County changed the name of the park to La'aloa from Disappearing or Magic Sands, and across the bay (by the wall and present restaurant), there was another punawai (spring) near the shore as well.

12 - Aunty Luciana recalled that her mother told her the bay between La'aloa Park and their former kuleana at Pāhoehoe was named Ma'alaea, not
Pāhoehoe. The land was Pāhoehoe, the bay was Ma’alaea. Uncle Lolina remembered that the northern point of the bay, right below the Kīpapa’s land was called Manawaea, and the old canoe landing that had been used by his kūpuna (Kīpapa mā) was there.

All of these kūpuna urge that it is important to respect the old places, not to change them beyond recognition, but to care for them and tell the history of the land.

The above historical notes were reviewed for accuracy and content, and released for use in this study.

Lily Namakaokai’a Ha’anio-Kong (January 28, 1997)
Luciana Ka’ailehua Makuakāne-Tripp (February 1, 1997)
Lolina (Lawrence) Makuakāne (February 2, 1997)
Daniel and Lucy Kailiwi (February 2, 1997)
Zachary Kapule (February 20, 1997)

Excerpts from Previously Collected Oral History Interviews
The following discussion summaries and notes highlight key points of interest and concern shared by the individuals contacted. The names of the interviewees, a brief background sketch, the date of contacts, and date of the release of the information are included with each interview.

Valentine K. Ako
In January 1996, while conducting oral history interviews in North Kona, Uncle Valentine K. Ako (VA) described the land and its resident families in c. 1935-1940. Excerpts of his interview are included here, as they provide us with a glimpse into activities on the La’aloa-Pāhoehoe shore line at that time. Uncle moved away from Kona 50 years ago, and presently lives on Kaua‘i, because he did not watch the changes come to Kona, in his minds eye he still sees Kona as it was in his youth. It is also noted here, that on March 18, 1996, Uncle Val called the author from Kaua‘i, he had just heard in the news that there was a debate on naming the La’aloa-Pāhoehoe Parks and removing boulders from the shore to try and increase the amount of sand. This caused Uncle great concern, he believes that it is very important to leave the shore line as it is naturally, and that the proper names, La’aloa and Pāhoehoe, in their individual locations are important to preserve.

KM: . . .So if we come to Pāhoehoe now, next, after Hōlualoa, yeah, we enter Pāhoehoe. When I mention Pāhoehoe does something come to mind?
VA: Pāhoehoe was noted for that ko’a for ‘ō‘io. Because the place was sandy and the ‘ō‘io school used to be loaded over there, you know. Even up to my time adjacent to Pāhoehoe is La’aloa. What I remember of La’aloa was the Kāne family and their canoe and catching ‘ōpelu. And old man Kāne was the one that caught large squid, he’e. And he, you know, the way he did it is with that banyan tree leaf, eh.

KM: Oh, so he made the lūhe’e just like but it instead of using leho you said...?
VA: The banyan tree leaf.

8 Manawa-ea: Handwritten notes from discussions with Nāluahine Ka’ōpua, in the collection of Theodore Kelsey record that at Manawa-ea, “there is a round stone in the sea named Pohaku o Ku” (Kelsey, c. 1950).
KM: So he put rock and then he put the leaf of the banyan tree over.

VA: Yeah.

KM: And I think you were saying, “oh, funny, it ends up the he’e is attracted to anything,” yeah.

VA: Yeah, to anything, you know. That's what I know about the Pāhoehoe. And it's true, Pāhoehoe during the winter months is dry, is all rocks, but during the summer months, all the sand come back, eh. And then the kuleana on the left side, where this man Sydney Lytham was, the Inaba family took care of him. They claim he was a criminal, but he really knew how to throw the knife. you know, the butter knife? Somebody went make him angry, was where that Kim Chung store by Moku'aikaua Church. And he swung the [pauses and chuckles] . .the butter knife, just to demonstrate how powerful his throw was. You know the 4X4, if you throw the knife this way you go right inside, the thing went all the way in this way. And he was noted, he was a good craftsman. He made a lot of koa furniture.

And he made the, you know, the entrance to the property, he used bottles, you know, beer bottles, gallons and everything, he went mold them all inside and make the two piers entrance to the house.

KM: So, he was in Pāhoehoe?

VA: Yeah. between Pāhoehoe and La'aloa. But La'aloa had two canoes. Both canoes were the Kāne's. (pers. comm. January 8-10, 1996) Outside of La'aloa-Pāhoehoe had ko'a [a dedicated fishing ground] for ‘ō‘io, Kāne took care of that ko’a, and he even used to chase people out who didn't belong there. Nice ‘ō‘io, 10-15 pounds, and you could catch them by the canoe load (pers comm. February 28, 1997).

Uncle Val Ako gave his permission for inclusion of the above oral history interview excerpts in this study on February 28, 1997.

**E. Kalaniola Wilson-Hamm with Kepā Maly and Descendants of Keli‘ihulamū:**
- Hannah Wilson-Freitas (63 years)
- Agnes Kahulamū-Funk (66 years)
- Hattie Makini-Keana‘āina (70 years)
- Dorothy Wilson-Sipe (64 years)

In June 1996, as a part of the oral history interviews being conducted by the author in Kona, Kalaniola Hamm made arrangements for me to meet with her elder sisters and cousins (all born and raised in Kahalu‘u). During this informal interview, notes were taken, and were subsequently reviewed and released. The following excerpts record how sensitive this issue at La‘aloa is, and how difficult it has been for some of the native families of the region. If read, the following narratives can help planners and agency representatives take a closer look at their processes, and hopefully avoid future conflicts.

It is noted here, that a couple of the family members are so distrustful of the State and County—the result of their having seen so much destruction of family and Hawaiian sites in

---

9 Mrs. Keana‘āina passed away in February 1997; Mrs. Agnes Funk passed away in May 1997.
their lifetime—that they feel a sense of futility in even speaking about their family history or their love and relationship to the land. They stated for the record, that all of their sharing of information and concerns, as well as asking of questions (e.g., at County Planning and Parks and Recreation development meetings, and with DLNR-SHPD staff) over the years, has been ignored or otherwise gone unanswered, or been written up without acknowledgment of where the information came from. As a result, Mrs. Keanaʻaina states that she will not speak any more about her understanding of the history of Kona. She stated “When I die, it goes with me and my Tūtū!”

The following paraphrased summary of the family discussions, is presented in an indented, interview format, and was reviewed and released by Kalani on behalf of her family on June 6, 1996.

. . .Mrs. Keanaʻaina commented, “Why even come talk to us? The County and State don’t listen. They always do whatever they want. They never listen to what we ask or tell them.” She continued to comment, “Now it’s too late, so much has been destroyed. I’m disgusted already, and I don’t trust anyone with these histories, or to do what is right.”

Mrs. Keanaʻaina cited an example of a development in La’aloa, just mauka of Aliʻi Drive, in the vicinity of Magic Sands Beach Park, that should not have been allowed.

This particular area had been a c. 2.5-acre pen enclosed by a rock wall, in which a fine grove of hala trees grew. All of the ladies recalled that this grove of hala trees had been important to all of the families of Kahaluʻu, even families from as far away as Kailua and Honalo would come to gather this particular lau hala. Within this enclosure were also many old family burials. Mrs. Keanaʻaina and Mrs. Funk have tried time and time again to find out what happened to all of the burials, with no response from the State. Though even today, they still hear that people living in homes in that development find bones in the yards. “What's happened to all these bones?” In sadness, Mrs. Funk stated they probably just throw them away.

Also in the La’aloa area, just on the south of the beach park, the County’s proposal to put a parking lot and picnic area in the lot where the heiau Haukālua and other burials are located. Mrs. Keanaʻaina has gone to five meetings, and not once has she received an answer to her questions or comments regarding the proposal. All of the Kahulamū descendants at this meeting recalled that as children they came to this area with their Kūkū and parents. They gathered the lau hala, fished in the waters off of the beach and heiau vicinity, and gathered limu. Mrs. Keanaʻaina said, “That’s how we lived.” Now, they don’t want the Hawaiians down there using the place as we have for generations, and even though the boys (younger generation relatives) are trying to take care of the place, the County just arrests them. Mrs. Keanaʻaina noted that she had spoken with Henry Cho and other County representatives, as well as State people, who don’t want to listen to what the Hawaiian families are saying. She also commented, “How come they don’t kick the haoles out too? They only arrest the Hawaiians?” Other family members nodded their heads in agreement. . .
In response to what they felt about taking care of the heiau, family 'ilina (grave sites) and sites, Mrs. Keana'āina summed it up for the family by saying “Leave our heiau and places alone.” (pers. comm. June 1, 1996)

**Consultation Records—Community Participants**

It should be noted up front, that Zachary Kapule, representing the La’aloa ‘Ohana’s records that the ‘Ohana’s first desire is that the proposed parking lot not be built as presently planned. He proposes that parking arrangements be designed along the side of the Ali‘i Drive, with a portion of the embankment cut out to enhance access. The ‘Ohana proposes that this parking arrangement could extend down the makai shoulder of the road, towards the Kona Onenalo Complex. Also, it will be noted that all other participants in the interview process felt that the parking lot expansion could be accommodated, though the majority of the interview participants made specific site treatment and action recommendations in order to ensure protection of the sites (see also Apendicies A & B).

**Kahu (Reverend) Leon Sterling Jr.**

Meeting—January 15, 1997  
*(with short notes from subsequent telephone conversations)*

Kahu Leon Sterling Jr. (affectionately called Uncle by many people), was born in 1916, at Waikīkī, O'ahu. Kahu’s father was Leon Sterling Sr., his mother was Helen Kapua'ōhelo Paoa. His maternal genealogy is one of importance, and associated with the Hawaiian Monarchy. Kahu’s grandfather was Henry Ho'olai Paoa, and it was from this grandfather, in the days of his youth, that he first learned about Hawaiian cultural values and practices. As a youth, Kahu went to Kona a few times because his grandfather had relatives there, but it was not until around 1970, that Kahu found himself drawn back to Kona to live. Since that time, he has been active in preservation and many Hawaiian cultural and community issues, he also serves as the Kahu of the Helani Church at mauka Kahalu'u.

In the matter of La’aloa, Kahu has worked with the young people there, to try and strike a balance between the care and protection of Hawaiian sites and practices, and the County of Hawai‘i’s needs to improve access to the La’aloa Beach Park. Kahu offered the following comments and recommendations regarding the site preservation plan, during our conversation:

1. Kahu is very happy to see that the County is working on making a preservation plan, incorporating both historical knowledge and community knowledge and concerns for protection of the cultural and natural resources of the area. He notes that the La’aloa property is a sacred area, and that the plan to protect the heiau and iwi (burials) is important to the future. These cultural resources will help our children and others learn about the past, where we have come from. Kahu believes that “establishing an attitude of awe and respect” for the resources of La’aloa, must be one of the primary goals of the community and County in working towards long-term preservation of the cultural resources in the park.

---

10 Like other interested individuals, Kahu observes that the land is La’aloa, and the names “Disappearing-“ or “Magic-Sands” are not culturally appropriate or respectful; they urge changing the park name.
2 - Kahu notes that a lack of communication, and even miscommunication on the County’s part, has been the source of many of the problems between the County, community, and youth at La’aloa. He specifically cited the time when without any prior notice, the County allowed Kiewit Pacific Co. to bulldoze a portion of the property for vehicle access in association with the sewer line project.

He also observes that many people in the community, and particularly the “boys” and those who have worked to try and care for La’aloa have been very disappointed because of broken promises. And the delays in working on the park preservation and expansion project have made concerned people very uneasy. Kahu suggests that timely communication and honesty will help the parties avoid confrontation.

3 - Kahu observes that the members of the community and the youth at La’aloa are aware of the cultural sites the remain on the property. He notes that much of what once remained from the ancient Hawaiian period of history has already been destroyed, as a result of development on all but the ocean side of the property. The Hawaiian community feels strongly that it is important to preserve what is left.

4 - Protection of the iwi (or burials) is very important to the Hawaiians. The original burial sites and any reinterment sites must be set aside as “special places” to be protected and respected. The iwi are beloved, and are home to the spirit of those who came before us, they embody the unique personalities of those individuals who lived on this land (La’aloa), and in the Hawaiian sense, are considered ‘unihipili.

5 - In the matter of appropriate site buffers, Kahu notes first, that the use of the property for a park establishes an important buffer in itself. The park will serve as a buffer between the ocean and non-source point pollution. Kahu observes that so much of the Kona shoreline has been developed, that setting this property aside in its semi-natural state will enhance the integrity of the Kona shoreline, and help to support requirements for Coastal Zone Management.

Site Buffers and Signage: The physical buffers for the heiau and burials must be wide enough, to foster the sense that when people visit the sites, they know that they are in a sacred area. Use of native coastal plants, planted perhaps 20-30 feet away from the sites will help set the sacred sites apart from the remainder of the park. Additionally, it will be important design signage that shares with people, some of the history of the sites and land of La’aloa. The signage must be set in unobtrusive, yet visible locations, so that people can be informed about the sensitive nature of the sites.

6 - Kahu also feels that it would be appropriate to build a small traditional styled  hālau (open long-house) within the preservation area, dedicated to use as a place for meditation and cultural practices. Kahu observed that it is important to take the time to examine our relationship with the earth and those around us. In explanation of the depth of this relation ship, Kahu shared that as a result of his upbringing, he learned that it is important to listen to the “Kani o ke kai” and “Kani o ka ‘āina” (or Sounds of the Ocean and the Land).
By “listening to the sounds” of the ocean and land, we can better understand it. In the Hawaiian perspective, the earth is our mother, “How can your mother support you if you rape her?”

7 - Kahu believes that in order for a long term plan of site protection and interpretation to work, the County must work with the community to identify an individual or group that could serve as “Kahu” (Steward) of the varied resources, a Kahu that could help bring stability to the site and its interpretation and maintenance.

8 - **Specific Concerns About Park Development:** (a) Kahu wants to ensure that any work done on the park extension (i.e., equipment maneuvering or development of park amenities), will not be the source of any further damage to the heiau and other cultural sites. This may mean limiting the kinds of equipment used to prepare the ground for park layout and landscaping.

(b) Kahu also suggests that alternatives to asphalt topping be investigated for the new road access and parking area. Would some type of gravel, or compacted crushed coral be possible (e.g., the crushed coral-sand drive and parking area at the Kona Village Resort)? Such a parking facility at La’aloa would be much more aesthetically pleasing.

(c) One of the non-cultural issues which is of concern to the community is that the County ensure that the new parking access be clearly designated for “community use,” that commercial interests such as scuba and kayak rentals do not clutter up the parking lot with their for profit use of the new parking resource, pushing resident users back out onto the streets.

In closing, Kahu shared a thought that he had learned from his Tūtū, in sharing this mana’o (thought), he wrote on a sheet of paper, “When Mana’o Becomes Mana.” He explained, that it is because things have been thought out (mana’o) and practiced, that they become a source of power or empowerment (mana). He observed that experience is the source of lessons. It is up to all of us to learn from those lessons and to understand why things need to be done in a certain way, or in particular seasons. Once we have this knowledge, we have mana because it works. In this same way, the County’s working with the community on the La’aloa preservation plan can benefit everyone involved. (Notes reviewed and released on January 31, 1997)

**Alena Kaiokekoa (with Kawelu)**

**Meeting—January 16, 1997**

Alena Kaiokekoa is a native Hawaiian practitioner and steward of ancestral family lands at Ho’onā, Kalaoa, North Kona. Descended from native families with generations of residency in Kona, Uncle Alena has a deep commitment to care of Hawaiian resources, and also believes in sharing his mana’o (understanding and knowledge) of Hawaiian practices and customs with others. Uncle has been approached by the group at La’aloa, asking for his mana’o in various areas of cultural concerns. Alena shared with me that he has explained to the group at La’aloa, that though he has no direct association with La’aloa, he would be willing to assist in anyway he was able.

Uncle feels that there is a very important responsibility that comes with assuming, or even speaking of stewardship (ho’okahu ana). It is a responsibility that cannot be taken lightly, and it needs to be acted on and lived, it cannot simply be words. Thus, Uncle recommends that the final preservation plan include some specific treatments so that whoever assumes
the role (e.g., particular individuals, the County, or a partnership between families and the County), can have a clear sense of direction. Uncle Alena and Kawelu offered the following comments and recommendations regarding the site preservation plan for La’aloa, during our conversation:

1 - Site Stabilization: The first concern is the protection of the heiau and ‘ilina (burial sites). It is important that we “mālama o ka ‘āina” (care for, or protect the land), and that the cultural sites be cared for. We must also help people to learn that the sites are sacred. Uncle does not believe that the sites should be reconstructed any further than can be remembered as being structurally appropriate, but stabilization is important to help keep the sites from deteriorating further. Rebuilding heiau and other traditional sites without proper knowledge can make trouble for the people and the sites, we must only rebuild what is proper.

2 - Burial and Reinterment Sites: On February 16, 1996, E. Halealoha Ayau went to Ho’onā to leave a pū’olo iwi (bundle or package of remains) that had come from La’aloa with Uncle Alena. Halealoha had been asked to take the pū’olo iwi to Uncle, because the La’aloa boys “did not know the protocol for their return to La’aloa.” Uncle explains that a series of events took place over that night, that made it clear to him that the iwi (funerary remains) needed to be returned to La’aloa. Uncle explains that on the next day (Feb. 17th), he discerned that the iwi had come from a particular location on the makai facing side of the heiau. That day, Uncle, Kawelu, and Fred Himalaya took the iwi home to La’aloa. Upon going to the heiau, Uncle saw an area mid-way in the heiau, on the makai side, where there was a small ahu (cairn-like feature) and an opening down into a crypt-like feature. It was in this crypt opening that the iwi were reinterred. It was also observed that other iwi were already in place in this ‘ilina (a formal burial site). At that time, in February 1996, there was a small ahu with four stacked stones, marking the grave and reinterment site.

Marc Smith of DLNR-SHPD was informed of the reinterment process and the area identified to him.

Specific Comments and Recommendations:

3 - The proper name of the area is La’aloa. The name is a part of our history, and is unique. I don’t know who named the area Magic Sands or Disappearing Sands, or why the name was changed. It is recommended here, that the place name La’aloa be preserved in the park’s name.

4 - (a) Work on the park improvements will need to be done carefully so as not to further impact the stone work on the heiau and other sites; (b) also, it will be important to monitor parking traffic impacts on the sites (that ground vibrations do not cause further site deterioration).

5 - Monitoring: (a) It has been observed that in the area of the old Government Kailua-Keauhou Road, that there are ‘ili’ili (small water worn pebbles) covering the ground. These ‘ili’ili indicate that traditional kahua platforms or some type of features were once in the area now being proposed for the road-parking access. Monitoring of work during any ground movement should occur to watch for any cultural material.
(b) Because of the known presence of iwi on the property, and because Aunty Hattie Keana'aina has indicated that there may be more burials in the vicinity of the hau (Hibiscus tiliaceus) grove, monitoring should be required during the entire phase of ground work. Monitoring will help insure that any cultural sites or burials inadvertently located during ground work could be properly cared for.

6 - Kawelu noted that an upright Kū'ula (stone fish god) is still near the shore at La’aloa. But because the County was afraid that it might fall over on someone, they knocked it down. It is recommended here, that the Kū'ula be restored, and that a protective buffer be set around it.

Buffers and Signage:
7 - In determining the protective buffers that will need to be established, we must first know how far the edge of the closest part of the parking lot-road access is from the heiau and other cultural sites.

It appears that the mauka edge of the heiau is approximately 50 feet away from the makai edge of the road access (this will be confirmed with County representatives).

8 - Buffers of appropriate native coastal plants need to be set in place, to mark the end of the general public park access and beginning of the cultural site preserve. The boundaries need to be clear, and signage will need to be set in place so as to deter inappropriate site uses. Examples of kinds of inappropriate uses include, but are not limited to: (a) use of stones by picnickers to make fire pits; (b) eating, sleeping, and sunbathing on the sites; and (c) drinking and use of drugs etc., in the preservation areas.

9 - Uncle stated that sharing our history with our youth and other people, is very important, and one way to do this is by sharing the stories of the land with them in signs and by talking story, person to person. He observed:

It is important to find and take care of the beauty in the ocean and the land. The land gives us shelter food, medicine, and life, the ocean gives us fish, seaweeds, salt, and life. We must not do things that haumia (defile) the land and ocean. If we can talk story, and share the beauty of the land and ocean with other’s, and how important the land and ocean are to our own well being, we will find ourselves. We must do this, find (understand) the beauty within the land, find the beauty within the ocean, and we will find the beauty within our selves.

If the park expansion can be done without impacting the native sites, or hurting the families (burials) that are there, expanding the park use will be okay. (Notes reviewed and released on January 24, 1997)

Zachary Kapule
Hawaiian Practitioner and Member of the La'aloa ‘Ohana
Meeting—February 3 & 20, 1997
Following the site visit of January 22nd with members of the Makuakâne family and Aunty Lily Kong, arrangements were made to meet with Zachary Kapule, to further discuss his mana‘o (thoughts) regarding the La’aloa Park expansion project. Though his immediate
family is from South Kona, Zachary has been coming to the La’aloa beach area since the 1960s, and has been participating on some level in activities with the group now formally identified as the “La’aloa ‘Ohana” for several years. Zachary notes that while the membership has changed, and levels of activities have grown, the La’aloa ‘Ohana has been in existence for five to six years. The ‘Ohana’s primary interest is protection of the cultural and natural resources of the La’aloa Beach area. Zachary states up front, “I honestly don’t want to see a parking lot built on this property.”

At the time of conducting this informal interview, Zachary and La’aloa ‘Ohana members were preparing the heiau and grounds for a ceremony to commemorate the closing of the Makahiki of Lono. Such observances are a part of the responsibility that the La’aloa ‘Ohana feels it has, as stewards of the ‘āina (land). The following paraphrased notes record several key points—observations, concerns, and recommendations—made by Zachary during our discussion and walk around the property. On February 10th, a draft of the notes was given to Zachary for review and comment. Following his review, he noted that the notes had basically recorded what was discussed and on February 20, 1997, Zachary gave his permission to include the notes in this preservation plan.

1 - Zachary reports that in the years that the La’aloa ‘Ohana has been actively involved in stewardship of the resources at La’aloa, ‘Ohana members have:

(a) worked cleaning the property around the heiau, and other cultural sites;
(b) monitored activities around the sites, reporting on vandalism to DLNR;
(c) sought out advice from area kūpuna (elders), in the best ways to care for the resources (elder resources have included Hattie Makini-Keana‘āina, Margaret Grace, Gabriel Makuakāne, and Kahu Sterling);
(d) cared for the Kū‘ula that was identified by area elders;
(e) cultivated Hawaiian plants, working on developing an ethnobotanical garden;
(f) participated in the Family Court Juvenile Community Service Project, in which Hawaiian youth have served their public service hours helping maintain the sites and garden; and
(g) and made efforts to come to an agreement on site protection and use with the County of Hawai‘i and DLNR-SHPD.

(further details on several of the above activities follow)

2 - Following group discussions and consultation with Margaret Grace of Ka‘ū, the La’aloa ‘Ohana stabilized the heiau ruins; work was initiated approximately nine months ago.

When asked if any of the original, remaining features of the heiau had been preserved, Zachary stated that all the ‘Ohana had done, was to gather up the loose stone that had been washed down off of the heiau, and restacked it. The makai section of the heiau had been almost completely destroyed by wave action. The original features, like exposed foundation and wall alignments that remained under the rubble, are still intact, under the replaced stone work.
When asked, Zachary also stated that the coral placed around the present, tiered levels of the heiau, has a kaona (hidden, or multiple layered meaning), that was shared with the group by Aunty Margaret Grace. A significant focus of the work has been to try and help to reestablish the sacredness of the heiau, so that the children can learn about, and have pride in the culture of La’aloa.

3 - A little more than two years ago, members of the ‘Ohana observed pot-hunting occurring in the heiau. Trenches had been dug into the site. It was the ‘Ohana that reported this, and the fact the iwi (or funerary remains) had also been exposed as a result of the pot-hunting.

In February of 1996, the exposed remains that had been collected by Marc Smith (DLNR-SHPD), for safe keeping, were reinterred on the heiau, in the location where they had been taken from. Those iwi, remain protected within the rebuilt heiau. To-date, no other human remains have been located on the property, though at least one kūpuna (Hattie Makini-Keana‘āina) has stated that there are other burials on the property.

Over the years, the ‘Ohana members have cleared under the hau growth on the northern-makai side of the property. Following up on Reinecke’s records of 1930, and Marc Smith’s field work, I asked Zachary if he had seen any evidence of stone work (platforms, burials, or other features) under the hau. None had been located, but Zachary noted that maybe the house sites recorded earlier may have been for the pu‘ukū (stewards) or guardians of the heiau.

4 - The Kū‘ula was identified by kūpuna, and when the ‘Ohana set it back up (the fish increased in significant numbers), County Parks representatives told the ‘Ohana members to lay it down, because someone could get hurt if it fell on him/her. While this did not seem right to ‘Ohana members, how to properly care for the Kū‘ula had not been clear. Zachary noted that he was very pleased that Aunty Luciana, Aunty Lily, and Uncle Lolina mā had come down and shared their mana‘o about it’s restoration. Zachary supports the recommendation that a small kahua (platform) be made on the pāhoehoe rise just to the south of where the Kū‘ula is presently resting, and that the Kū‘ula be set upright facing the ocean (see further details in the interview of January 22, 1997).

Specific Comments and Concerns Regarding the Proposed Park Expansion:

1 - It has been the ‘Ohana’s desire to dedicate the entire Inaba lot, including the old well, heiau, the other site overlooking the southern cove, old Government Road remnant, and the artifact scatter that was impacted by both the old and new roads, into a cultural preserve. The members have planted a number of Hawaiian plants in various areas, trying to make an ethnobotanical garden. Many of the ‘Ohana’s efforts have been destroyed by the County’s unannounced bulldozing activities, and this has led to anger, and “kill fight;” no one wants to work on something that’s just going to be destroyed. “If we try to exercise our responsibilities as kahu, stewards, is the County going to just come and knock it, or us down again?”
2 - The ‘Ohana feels strongly that having the new parking lot on an elevation that overlooks the heiau is "inappropriate." Zachary observed, “Now they want to put their parking lot next to our church. There are people who are coming back to the heiau, and we are preparing for the ceremonies to mark the closing of the Makahiki this week (February 5, 1997). This is a sacred area, one of the few open lots along this shore of Kona, and a parking lot on the level of the heiau would be desecration.”

3 - The ‘Ohana suggests that the parking be maintained on the level of the Ali‘i Drive, and that a few feet of the lava rise, be cut out to add parking space. This parking arrangement could be done along the entire property and past the little cove to the south. That way, the area on top of the lava rise, towards the heiau and shore line could be made into the ethnobotanical gardens, and a hālau could be built in the vicinity of the old road-former Inaba house.

   Zachary notes that if traffic and speed have been a problem in the past, the County should just step forward and enforce the parking and speed regulations, even if they put speed bumps on the road to get people to slow down, that’s okay.

4 - The ‘Ohana proposes that a hālau be built (there are many people who have volunteered to help gather the ‘ōhi‘a logs, pili, and other necessary materials), and that the hālau serve as a cultural center. Zachary noted that it is his hope that kūpuna will come back to the land at La‘aloa to weave, ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i (speak Hawaiian), teach lā‘au lapa‘au (medicinal uses of plants), reflect on their history, and teach the youth and other interested people.

   Zachary believes that such a use of the land at La‘aloa “will help bring back a lot of the knowledge that our kūpuna have.” He also stated that he strongly believes that “this is why this place was named La‘aloa (very sacred), because the land and the teachings are sacred.”

5 - As a part of the above vision for the La‘aloa site, Zachary suggests that, “If there is nothing significant about, or underneath the old Inaba house slab, that the slab should be removed, and the land restored to a natural state.

6 - Responsibility: Zachary noted that “The ‘Ohana has always tried to mālama (take care or protect) as much as they can here at La‘aloa.” If the County comes in and opens this place up, they are going to have to carry the burden, of ensuring that our sacred sites are respected. The closer the access to the heiau, the greater the likelihood that people will stray into the area. Right now, Zachary observes, “It’s like we’re paying for the County’s negligence.”

7 - Zachary agrees that culturally sensitive interpretive signs and a buffer would be helpful, and says that the ‘Ohana is committed to caring for the area, but, the ‘Ohana cannot take responsibility for other people’s mistakes.

8 - Prior to finalizing plans for work on the La‘aloa Park Expansion, Zachary suggests that the County and various interested parties get together to work out a plan that will be mutually acceptable. (Notes released on February 20, 1997)
Consultation Records–Agency Representatives

Ruby Keana‘aina-McDonald
Meeting—January 15, 1997
Ruby Keana‘aina-McDonald is a life-long resident of Kona, with many family ties to the region. While she is the West Hawai‘i Community Resource Coordinator with the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), and the North Kona representative to the Hawai‘i Island Burial Council, her comments do not necessarily represent the thoughts or policies of those agencies. In response to questions about La‘aloa and the proposed beach park expansion, Ruby shared the following comments and observations:

1 - Ruby’s first concern, in the form of a question was, “Is the preservation plan going to address, or include a burial treatment plan?”

We discussed what is known of remains that have been located on the La‘aloa property. Noting that in February 1996, E. Halealoha Ayau (DLNR-SHPD Burials Program Coordinator), had attempted to reinter remains that had been previously removed from the site (see also the discussion notes with Alena Kaiokekkoa in this document). Because of the uncertainty of the number and location of burial sites in the study area, at the time of this conversation, Ruby recommended that I speak with both Virginia Goldstein, Director of the Hawai‘i County Planning Department, and Marc Smith, Hawai‘i Island Archaeologist with DLNR-SHPD (calls were made to both individuals on January 15th; see discussion notes with Marc Smith).

2 - Based on her experience with the Hawai‘i Island Burial Council (HIBC), Ruby feels that the HIBC will recommend that the burials be preserved in place, and that funerary remains that have been previously removed from the area be reinterred from place of origin if possible, if not they should be reinterred on site.

3 - Depending on which category DLNR-SHPD uses to identify the burial sites (i.e., known or inadvertent), Ruby also believes that a Burial Treatment Plan will need to be reviewed and approved by the HIBC. If the sites are designated as “known burials,” a treatment plan will need to go to the Council for a formal review. If the sites are designated as “inadvertent discoveries,” DLNR-SHPD will review the plan, and elicit comments from the HIBC in an informal review.

4 - Without a full understanding of the nature and extent of the number of burial sites, buffers in general, should be made by planting of appropriate coastal native plants. Depending on site use and levels of surrounding park develop, it is likely that a minimum 15-foot buffer would be required. If the heiau and burials features are relatively close (with sites overlapping), one buffer around the sites would be appropriate. If the sites do not overlap, multiple buffered areas, with access between sites could be appropriate.

5 - Interpretive signage for the heiau, should be set in unobtrusive locations and specific “cultural sensitivity” signage for burials—texts not specifically identifying the site(s) as burials—should be developed to foster site protection. (Notes reviewed and released on February 3, 1997)
Marc Smith, Hawai'i Island Archaeologist  
Department of Land and Natural Resources-  
State Historic Preservation Division  
Meeting—January 21, 1997

Marc Smith is the resident of Hawai'i Island archaeologist with the Department of Land and Natural Resources-Historic Preservation Division (DLNR-SHPD). In this capacity, he has conducted an archaeological survey of the La'aloa study area with Virginia Goldstein, James Head, and Carol Kawachi (Smith et al., in prep). As a follow-up to personal conversations last year with Billy Fields, E. Halealoha Ayau, and Virginia Goldstein, and conversations this year with Ruby Keana'āina-McDonald and Alena Kaiokekoa as apart of this study, the author contacted Marc Smith, who agreed to discuss his findings.

The following notes represent a summary of key points discussed with Marc regarding the La'aloa property, with general locations of certain features identified on a rough map (Figure 5). The final report, being prepared by Marc for DLNR-SHPD, should be consulted if further information is needed. The paraphrased notes below, were reviewed for content, and were released by Marc for use in this study.

1 - Known Burial Remains: DLNR-SHPD has identified the burial remains as an “inadvertent discovery” because they were located at Haukālua Heiau, as a result of looting that had occurred a little over two years ago. At that time, it was discovered that the south and makai facing walls of the heiau had been dug into by looters (pothunters). As a result of the digging, sections of set stone (evidence of wall alignments and a platform) were exposed from under the surface layer of wave washed rubble. The burial remains were located in the makai facing side of the heiau (Figure 5.).

Marc noted that as a result of a call from the La'aloa 'Ohana, he was notified of the presence of the remains, and that he collected them for safe keeping until DLNR-SHPD’s Burial Program Coordinator could make arrangements for their reinterment. Following discussions between E. Halealoha Ayau, the La'aloa 'Ohana and Alena Kaiokekoa, the remains were returned to their place of origin at the heiau, Haukālua (cf. Alena Kaiokekoa above). At the request of Marc Smith, I spoke with Zachary Kapule on January 22nd, and confirmed that the iwi (burial remains) are still in their burial reinterment site on the heiau.

2 - Haukālua Heiau and other Cultural Sites in the La'aloa Study Area: Based on historic archaeological work conducted by J. F. G. Stokes (Stokes and Dye 1991) and J. Reinecke (Ms. 1930), Marc is certain that the primary site in the study area is the heiau, Haukālua (SIHP No. 2009). Marc notes that up to one year ago, most of the surface features of the heiau had been significantly impacted by waves from the ocean, and the inland and northern facing walls and platform had been impacted by bulldozing; probably done when clearing portions of the lot for residence use. As noted above, looters exposed subsurface remains showing the presence of wall alignments, platform paving, interior structural construction, recorded during the 1995 archaeological study. The subsurface, makai facing wall alignment of the heiau also appears to extend further north than indicated on the County’s proposed park expansion map (Figure 5.).
(a) On the mauka side of the platform ruins (up to approximately one year ago) two slightly elevated paved areas were identified. It is posited that this elevated stone slab paving is a later addition to the heiau, possibly covering burials that were set in place. No test units were put into the features (Figure 5.).

It is noted here that recent “reconstruction” of the heiau has significantly changed the surface (and possibly the subsurface) features described above (Nos. 1, 2, & 2a).

(b) On the shoreward pāhoehoe flats, below the heiau, is a papamū (kōnane board), that is elevated in a natural rise on the lava, creating the impression of it being on a turtle’s back. People in the area now call it “Turtle Rock” (Figure 5.), and the feature is a cultural resource.

(c) To the south of the heiau, are the ruins of stone platform; it’s appearance suggests that it may be the remains of an early house site (Figure 5.). The platform has two surface features: (1) the interior section which appears to be the section that was enclosed for the house; and (2) an exterior section that may have served as a lānai, or patio-like feature around the house.

(d) In the small cove, just south and below the stone platform, is a canoe landing (Figure 5.).

(e) Around the old Government Road at northern end of the property (in line with the house foundation and to the north of it), where portions of the proposed parking lot will be built, there is abundant evidence of midden (e.g., coral, ‘ili’ili {water worn pebbles}, animal bone fragments, basalt flakes, and coral abraders). This material can also be traced across Ali‘i Drive, to the mauka side of the road (Figure 5.).

(f) Evidence of similar midden is present around the foundation of the former Inaba family residence. As a result, it is believed possible that the area below the cement slab may contain a cultural layer. [DLNR-SHPD will provide guidance to the County of Hawaii on how work in the area should proceed (e.g. monitoring by an archaeologist, during ground work)].

Marc notes that the County may want to consider using the existing slab for a park pavilion, thus leaving the site in place.

(g) At one small community meeting approximately two years ago, Marc reports that Mrs. Hattie Makini-Keana‘āina11 was concerned about sites in the hau grove, that extends from the present park restroom facility to the edge of the heiau (Figure 5.). It is her belief that there are additional burial sites within the hau grove. Citing Reinecke’s field notes and maps

---

11 In June 1996, the author conducted an informal oral history interview with Mrs. Keana‘āina, her sister and several cousins. She expressed deep concern about the La‘aloa area and the way that the State and County had handled events up to that time (see interview records above).
(the maps do not give a good scale for site locations), Marc observes that Reinecke refers to an additional “two or three old house sites, a pen, and well” (Reinecke’s Site 15, IN this study), and suggests that the hau growth has covered these sites. Marc entered the hau thicket as far as he could, and was unable to identify any features. [DLNR-SHPD will provide guidance to the County of Hawaii on how work in the area should proceed.]

(Notes reviewed and released on January 27, 1997)

It is noted here, that additional areas of concern and/or likely treatment recommendations were discussed between the author and Marc Smith. Pursuant to direction from DLNR-SHPD (letter of D. Hibbard to D. Uchida July 30, 1997), DLNR-SHPD will put it’s formal comments in signed correspondence.
IV. LA‘ALOA: SITE PRESERVATION PLAN

Background
Cultural and historic resources are tangible and intangible aspects of cultural systems that are valued by or representative of a given culture, or that contain information about a culture. Such resources are finite and non-renewable and include but are not limited to sites, structures, districts, objects and historic documents associated with, or representative of peoples, cultures, and human activities and events, either in the past or in the present. Cultural and historic resources can also include the primary written and verbal data for interpretation and understanding of those resources (Adapted from NPS - 28; 1981). “The basic premise of Cultural Resource Management is that cultural resources [like natural resources] are nonrenewable and are becoming increasingly endangered by activities which modify the landscape” (McGimsey and Davis 1977:22). Federal, state, and local laws require the mitigation of adverse impacts on cultural resources. Cultural resources management involves a delicate balance between caring for one’s history and cultural past and the long-term benefits of preservation planning, and the immediate needs of today.

Through a program of preservation and conservation, one strives to maintain the integrity of a site and the values (cultural, environmental, esthetic, and scientific) which contribute to its significance. The long-term maintenance, curation and protection of resources are goals of a carefully designed preservation plan-interpretive program. Likewise, the involvement of Hawaiian community members–area residents–in the formulation stages of this preservation plan and their long-term involvement in the preservation interpretive processes is important to the success of preservation efforts at La‘aloa.

Hawai‘i Administrative Rules, Title 13 (Department of Land and Natural Resources), Subtitle 13 (State Historic Preservation Rules), Chapter 277 (Rules Governing Minimal Requirements for Archaeological Site Preservation and Development) (Draft Dec. 12, 1996) provided guidelines for development of this preservation plan. As called for in those rules, detailed recommendations were elicited from native Hawaiian members of the community and DLNR-SHPD. Those recommendations for site treatment, preservation buffers access, and interpretation are highlighted in Section III., Tables 2-a and 2-b above. Further specific standard practice treatments for implementation of interim (short-term) and long-term site preservation are outlined below.

Sites Identified Within the La‘aloa Study Area
Based on previous archaeological studies and information collected as a part of this study, it is proposed that the County of Hawaii establish a preservation buffer that includes an area on the north side of the heiau (Site 2009), extending south along the makai boundary of the old Government Road easement, down to the shore line at La‘aloa Bay. The preservation zone will be delineated by the shoreline on the makai facing boundaries (Figure 7.). The preservation zone will provide a buffer between the sites and areas of the park dedicated to general public use, and includes:

(Area A)
Site 2009 — Haukālua Heiau and burial site;
Site 20,764 — stone platform (possibly a kahua hale, or house site foundation);
Site 21,221 — identified through oral history interviews as a paena wa‘a (canoe landing);
Figure 7. La'aloa Beach Park—Preservation Plan Map; Identifying Sites and Treatment Recommendations.
Site 21,222 — a papamū, or Hawaiian checker board set in the pāhoehoe flats; and
Site 21,223 — shoreline bait bowls set in the pāhoehoe flats.

Additionally, three other sites on the La'aloa Beach Park property were identified through archival research and interview documentation. Preservation treatments and protective buffers have been recommended for these sites as well (Figure 7.). The sites are:

(Area B) Site 21,218 — remnants of the iwi 'āina or boundary wall between the
ahupua'a of La'aloa-iki and Pāhoehoe 4th;

(Area C) Site 21,219 — identified in oral history interviews as a spring site (historic narratives
recorded by Reinecke {1930} and Nāluahine Ka'ōpua {c. 1950},
document the occurrence of such a coastal spring); and

(Area D) Site 21,220 — a Kū'ula (fishing deity stone) — all that remains from a fishing shrine
once situated near the shore of the beach park. Former native
residents of the La'aloa-Pāhoehoe shore line have proposed that
the Kū'ula be preserved on a small 'ilii'iili (water-worn pebble)
covered kahua (platform) to be built on a pāhoehoe rise overlooking
the ocean at Ka-iae-o-ka-Huihui (the point of Huihui). Additionally,
as a result of the meeting of May 19, 1997, it has been suggested,
and agreed upon that a large stone, presently situated between the
volley ball court and the parking area, be situated in the vicinity of
the Kū'ula (see Appendix A).

Interim (Short-term) Preservation Recommendations
It is the goal of interim preservation measures to physically identify sensitive cultural
resources within a development area and provide them with adequate preservation buffers
to ensure their preservation during phases of construction. The sites identified within this
report which will require interim preservation buffers include Areas A, B, C, and D (Figure
7.). Interim preservation buffers for these areas will be designated with brightly colored
construction fencing, four to six feet in height. Interim preservation will be ensured by
adopting the following general protective measures (preservation buffer zones and
treatment recommendations are based on the outcome of community discussions):

Overall Site Protection

1. All preservation area will be plotted accurately on grading plans and
   construction plans prior to the initiation of any grading, grubbing, and/or
   construction activities;
2. Construction will not be allowed to occur within the protective buffer zones.
   Buffer zones will be identified and mapped around all site perimeters.
   Installation of the preservation buffer zones will be supervised by
   archaeologists, and DLNR-SHPD will be notified when buffers zones are set
   in place.
3. Explicit notification of construction supervisors as to the nature and location of
   the preservation zones, the significance of the buffer zones, and the color
   and meaning of any site perimeter and buffer zone fencing;
4. On-site monitoring by archaeologists and community members, of initial
   construction grubbing and grading in the immediate vicinity of all sites to be
   preserved (the County has the responsibility to notify individuals who
   participated in the meetings of April 9th and May 19th, 1997 of work
   schedules—see Appendices A & C). Monitoring will also ensure that
construction activities—use of equipment in developable portions of the parcel do not adversely affect the cultural sites;
5. The protective buffer zone fencing will remain in place until construction and land movement activities are completed, then the interim preservation buffer fencing will be removed and long term preservation measures will be implemented;
6. No stones may be removed from within the preservation zones. Stone broken during construction of the parking lot and in other ground work will be kept on site for use in development of buffers and other park amenities.

Protection of Burial Sites
7. In compliance with Chapter 6E-43 (as amended by Act 306), should any burial remains be inadvertently discovered as a result of work on the park, all work in the area of the remains will cease and DLNR-SHPD will be notified within three days. Likewise, if remains should be exposed through natural processes or as a result of park-related activities, DLNR-SHPD will be notified as above. Disposition of any identified remains will be determined on a case-by-case basis in consultation with DLNR-SHPD (the HIBC), and individuals with familial ties to La'aloa.

During the period of construction on the park improvements, no construction or land modification activities, other than appropriate landscaping, interpretation, and maintenance will occur within the designated preservation zones, with the exception of tree removal if trees have been damaged by natural causes. Where the existing introduced kiawe (algaroba), opiuma (the Manila tamarind) and other plants will not impact the cultural sites, the trees will be left in place.

Long-term Preservation Recommendations
Following completion of construction of the park improvements, long-term preservation treatments, including site stabilization, landscaping, interpretation, and monitoring will begin. The long-term maintenance, curation and protection of resources is the goal of a carefully designed preservation—interpretation plan. It is through interpretation that local communities and island visitors alike will gain a better understanding of, and awareness of the unique and fragile nature of Hawai‘i’s resources. Awareness will in turn foster an environment for the protection and preservation of La‘aloa’s resources. Concerns for long-term preservation include:

1. **Documentation of Site Conditions** and perimeters for future references in documenting site stability and/or evolution. The County of Hawaii will work with community members and DLNR-SHPD in compiling an archival catalogue of site conditions and treatments. The catalogue will serve as the “control” for monitoring reviews which may be conducted by DLNR-SHPD and/or HCPD & PR staff, and the site stewards. The catalogue will be housed with DLNR-SHPD, the offices of the Hawai‘i County Planning Department and Department of Parks and Recreation (HCPD & PR), Ka ‘Ohana o La‘aloa (or a designated community stewardship group), and the Kona Historical Society.
2. Monitoring Site Integrity — determining and assigning maintenance schedules for landscaping and litter control, and monitoring levels of pedestrian impact and/or inappropriate site uses. Because of the sensitive nature of the sites (e.g., sites with ceremonial burial functions) and the past occurrences of vandalism, native Hawaiian community members recommend that access within the preserve—on the heiau or other areas above the vegetation line—be restricted to individuals with cultural affiliation to the sites, or guided by knowledgeable individuals. Interested individuals may make arrangements for site visitation through the County of Hawaii Department of Parks and Recreation, or through preservation site stewards. Primary interpretive programs will be in the form of off-site interpretive exhibits.

3. Site Interpretation — Interpretive signs that identify the preservation sites at appropriate (unobtrusive) locations will provide: the feature type; SIHP number; a cultural overview-site history; and a statement about the sensitive nature of archaeological sites (see section titled “Site Interpretation: La’aloa Preservation Sites” for samples of texts).

Visitation to the cultural sites will be limited to appropriate uses; i.e., cultural observances as practiced by native practitioners, and Hawaiian cultural interpretive programs. For general viewing, the sites will be visible from the public access areas of La’aloa Park.

Landscaping and Grounds Maintenance
Where the existing vegetation will not impact the cultural sites, the vegetation will be left in place. In areas where inappropriate vegetation should be cleared to foster site preservation and enhance view planes, no plants will be pulled out by the roots, instead they will be cut to the surface level and spot treated with a poison approved by DLNR-SHPD, so as not to impact any possible sub-surface remains. Additionally, appropriate native vegetation may be planted around the preservation site buffers.

If landscaping is to be done within the general vicinity of these sites, it is recommended that it be in keeping with the native and/or existing vegetation of the area. A variety of native Hawaiian coastal plants (as identified in historic literature and seen in similar coastal environmental zones) may be used for this task. The following plants are among those which were often found along the rocky shoreline and traditional communities of North Kona:

**Low shrubs**
- 'Ilima (Sida fallax)
- Kauna'o (Cuscuta sandwichiana)
- Kī (Cordyline terminalis)
- Ma'o (Native cotton; Gossypium sandwicensis)
- Nehe (Lipochaeta lavarum)
- Pāʻū-o-Hiʻiaka (Jaquemontia sandwicensis)
- Pōhinahina (Beach vitex; Vitex trifolia var. simplicifolia)
- Pōhuehue (Ipomoea pes-caprae)

**Trees**
- Hala (Pandanus odoratissimus)
- Hau (Hibiscus tiliaceus)
General Site Maintenance

It is recommended that waste receptacles be situated at several locations away from the preservation area buffers and in locations near the parking lot (Figure 7.). Waste receptacles are to be placed in such a way so as not to detract from the view planes to the sites, yet still be identifiable as waste receptacles. The waste receptacles could be heavy duty covered metal bins held in place between chain secured cemented pipes, or enclosed in wooden a stone enclosures. If metal bins are used, they should be painted in a color which blends in with the natural tones of the surrounding grounds. The County of Hawaii, Department of Parks and Recreation will establish a site maintenance monitoring schedule for maintenance of, and collection from these receptacles as well as coordinate the general landscaping, trail, and signage maintenance (waste receptacles to be checked on a daily schedule).

In order to ensure culturally sensitive, long-term site maintenance and site protection, the County of Hawaii, Department of Parks and Recreation will develop a program that informs grounds and maintenance staff of the requirements for site preservation. Among the topics to be addressed in the informational program are:

1. Training of maintenance personnel in appropriate maintenance techniques and of appropriate uses/visitation at the sites (No picnicking, camping, playing, removing of sand, dirt, or stones, etc., at/or from sites). Employees will be informed of who to call when inappropriate activities are observed;
2. Landscaping maintenance (no planting, irrigation, or use of herbicides, etc., without DLNR-SHPD approval)
3. Waste receptacle maintenance and collection
4. Maintenance of interpretive exhibits;
5. Site condition monitoring and notifying DLNR-SHPD and HCPD & PR of changes in site conditions.

Implementation of Interpretive Programs

This plan proposes that the County of Hawaii, in partnership with a community stewardship group, manage a passive interpretive program for preservation areas within the La’aloa Beach Park (Figure 7). Interpretation of the cultural resources is to occur at: Area A, including the Haukālua Heiau and a neighboring stone platform (Sites 2009, 20,764); the paena wa’a, or canoe landing (Site 21,221); a papamū, or stone slab checker board (Site 21,222); and the poho palu, or bait mortars (Site 21223); Area B, an iwi ‘āina or ahupua’a boundary wall (Site 21,218); Area C, a punawai or spring (Site 21,219); and Area D, the Kū’ula (Site 21,220). Examples of interpretive texts, and proposed locations of signs are provided in this section of the document, and identified on Figure 7. This plan suggests that the interpretive messages include: (a) brief site descriptions and appropriate graphics; (b) legendary and/or historic references; (c) cultural site protection law citations; and (d) personal safety statements. Periodic site visits, to be conducted by DLNR-SHPD, will confirm compliance with regulations and requirements for treatment of the preservation sites.
Site Interpretation: Laʻaloa Preservation Sites

Proposed Preservation Area A

Haukālua Heiau and a Neighboring Stone Platform
Ahupuaʻa of Laʻaloa-iki
(SITES 50-10-37-2009 and 50-10-37-20,764)

Please do not walk within the preservation area
(refrain from walking on these sites or removing rocks).
Damage to this preserve is punishable under
State Law, Chapter 6E-11, Hawaiʻi Revised Statutes.

The land of Laʻaloa, where you now stand, extended from the sea up to the fertile, forested uplands on the slopes of Hualalai volcano. The upland region was noted for its extensive agricultural field systems, and the coastal region was sought out as an area of residence, with access to the rich fisheries of leeward Hawaiʻi. The presence of the heiau (ceremonial site), known as Haukālua, indicates that this portion of the ahupuaʻa of Laʻaloa was one of importance in ancient Hawaiʻi. While it can not be stated with certainty, it is possible that the neighboring stone platform was once part of a residence complex. If contemporary with the use of the heiau, such a residence would have been home to an individual of importance, either a member of the aliʻi (chiefly) class, or someone of a kahuna (priestly) order.

This archaeological preserve contains several features. The heiau, Haukālua was formally recorded in an archaeological survey in the early 1900s. By that time, because of rapid depopulation and abolishment of the ancient Hawaiian religious system, and the impacts of waves on the shoreward side of the temple, the heiau was in a state of ruins. A 1906-07 Survey of the site reports:

Heiau of Haukalua, land of Laʻaloa, North Kona. Located on the north side of the bay, between the sea and the road. This is a low platform or terrace that rises to a height of four feet at its southwest corner. The northern and eastern sides are level with the ground. The location of the northeast corner is somewhat uncertain. [Thrum adds: “100 by 75 feet, little of which now remains” (I907a:44)- W T. B.] (Stokes and Dye 1991:63-64).

[Insert Figure, Stokes-Haukālua] Other sites within or adjoining this preserve include a paena waʻa (canoe landing) (Site 21221), and along the shoreward pāhoehoe lava shelf, the remains of a papamū (ancient Hawaiian checker board) (Site 21,222), and poho palu (bait mortars) (Site 21223). The latter two features are carved into the pāhoehoe shelf that fronts the sites. Unfortunately, little other information was recorded about the former residents of this property, or the nature of the heiau. Archaeological artifacts from these site place its use in the pre-historic period, up to the early 1800s. Today, native Hawaiian cultural practitioners care for this site and offer prayers at the heiau.
Iwi ‘Āina (Land Division Boundary Wall)
Ahupua’a of La’aloa-iki – Pāhoehoe 4th
(SITE 50-10-37-21,218)

Please do not walk on this site or remove rocks from the wall.
Damage to this preserve is punishable under
State Law, Chapter 6E-11, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes.

Based on historic surveys of the 1800s, this wall is the “iwi ‘āina” (a land division wall), that marked the boundary between the lands of La’aloa and Pāhoehoe. The ancient Hawaiians developed a sophisticated system of land management, in which the islands were divided into moku (districts), ‘okana (sub-districts), ahupua’a (land divisions generally including resources from the mountains to the sea), and ‘ili (smaller land units which were developed for their resources, within the larger ahupua’a). Generally, boundaries of the land units were marked by natural features such as hills, gullies, rock outcrops, trees, and man-made cairns or walls. Beginning in the early 1800s, after western contact, and the evolution of Hawaiian land management customs towards a western system, extensive wall systems came to be built. These walls often covered many miles of land, and served to not only mark boundaries, but also to keep foreign herbivores in, or out of particular lands.

This iwi ‘āina is the only remnant of the La’aloa-Pāhoehoe boundary wall remaining in the coastal section of the ahupua’a. Oral history interviews with former residents of the area, recall that by the late 1920s, the wall also served as the lot boundary between individual beach lot residences that were once situated in the park.
Proposed Preservation Area C

DLNR-SHPD concurrence with the historic designation of this feature will determine whether or not the spring will be formally assigned a SIHP site number. Regardless of its' SIHP designation, some level of interpretation will be of value to the overall park program. The interpretive text below, provides the County and community members with an example of how the site may be described.

Punawai (Spring)
Ahupua’a of La’aloa-iki
(SITE 50-10-37-21,219) [? To be determined by DLNR-SHPD]
Please do not walk in this site.
Damage to this preserve is punishable under
State Law, Chapter 6E-11, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes.

In Kona, potable water (wai), the wealth (waiwai) upon which life depended was primarily provided by springs, water caves, rain catchment, and dew fall, and legendary accounts record that numerous water sources were available to the early inhabitants of this land. Historical and archaeological studies tell us that the Kona coast line of Hawai‘i was permanently settled some time prior to AD 1000. And, the earliest inhabitants sought out the sheltered bays like that of La’aloa, which was supplied by several fresh- and brackish- water springs.

Because of the importance of water resources in ancient Hawai‘i, the wai (water) was considered to be very sacred, and a sophisticated system of water usage was developed to manage it. An archaeological survey of 1930, identified a small “pen and shallow pit, probably once a well” in this area. Historic narratives collected in the 1940s-1950s also recorded the presence of a named spring situated above the point called Ka-laee-o-ka-Huihui which is the boundary of La’aloa and Pāhoehoe. The elderly informant recorded:

Lehu-kapu, a spring, from which Pahoehoe and Laaloa obtained water (Komo ka wai o Pahoehoe me Laa-loa). . . Lae-o-ka-huihui at the south of the sand beach. Lehu-kapu komo paha iloko o ke one o Pahoehoe [Lehu-kapu spring perhaps enters in the sands of Pāhoehoe] (Kekahuna and Kelsey with Nāluahine, c. 1950).

Oral history interviews of 1997 also record that this spring was modified in the 1930s, and a Japanese furo (a fired heated tub for bathing and relaxation) was built adjoining the spring. The cement foundation of the furo may still be seen, marking the spring which has subsequently been filled in by debris.
Proposed Preservation Area D

Kū'ula (a fisherman’s god stone)  
Ahupua’a of La’aloa-iki  
(SITE 50-10-37-21,220)  
Please do not walk on this site or remove rocks from the platform.  
Damage to this preserve is punishable under  
State Law, Chapter 6E-11, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes.  
Fishing (lawai‘a) was one of the important occupations of ancient Hawai‘i. Many techniques were developed for harvesting marine resources, and the waters fronting La’aloa, on the Kona coast were noted for their fine fishing grounds. Whether fishing along the shore line, or many miles out at sea, the Hawaiians called upon deity to ensure abundance of fish, and safe journeys. Stones called Kū‘ula were believed to be imbued with the spirit of a fisherman’s god, and it was the custom to always place the first caught fish before the Kū‘ula, upon return to the shore.

The original location of this Kū‘ula has been lost due to natural and man-made changes to the land, but elder, former residents of the land remembered this stone as being a Kū‘ula which their grandparents called upon and placed offerings before. Indeed, it has been observed that when this Kū‘ula is set in the right position, facing the ocean, the numbers and variety of fish increase in the bay. Information collected during oral history interviews, suggested that the Kū‘ula might have been named Hōpoe. At the request of native elders, the Kū‘ula has been set upright once again, in a protected area, overlooking the ocean.
Summary of Preservation Plan Management Tasks
The following list (Table 3.) provides readers with a reference guide to primary preservation tasks for archaeological sites, and includes guidelines for protection of known burial sites and recommendation for inadvertent discoveries. The basis of these management tasks is documented above section of the study. Additional site treatment or site use recommendations are recorded in the interview section of this study, and may be worked out between community members as appropriate.

Table 3. Preservation Plan Management Tasks

| Preservation Area A — Establish protective buffers along boundaries of Site 2009 (Haukālua Heiau and burial site), Site 20,764 (a stone platform), and Sites 21,221, 21,222, and 21,223 (shore line features). On the north side of the heiau, the buffer will be 20-30 feet away from the edge of the heiau, extending from the shore to the makai edge of the old Government Road. Then following the old Government Road, the buffer will follow the makai boundary of said road, south to where the property bounds the Aliʻi Drive and enters the water of La‘aloa Bay. Then following the shoreline back to the place of commencement, north of the heiau. (For further guidance on management and protocol, see Appendices A & C.) |
| · A temporary buffer, following the above boundaries will be established, using bright colored construction fencing during phases of park improvement construction. Upon completion of park construction, the temporary buffer will be removed and a buffer of native plants, and where appropriate, a stone wall buffer will be set in place (stones removed from the construction area are to be retained on property for use in construction of the buffers and other park amenities). |
| · No plants will be pulled out by the roots, instead they will be cut to the surface level and spot treated with a poison approved by DLNR-SHPD, so as not to impact any possible sub-surface remains |
| · Construction and park maintenance workers will be notified of protocol for working in the vicinity of the preserve (e.g. no heavy equipment operation in preserve; no up rooting of existing trees or plants; notifying State/County Agencies of work schedules and having community and archaeologist monitoring of work during construction). |
| · Burial remains are to be protected in place, and if any remains should be inadvertently discovered, they will be treated on a case-by-case basis in concurrence with Chapter 6E-43 (as amended by Act 306). |
| · No stones are to be removed from within the preservation area. |
| · Sites are to be stabilized as ruins to help protect what remains of the ancient workmanship of the sites. Kūpuna have suggested that the coral presently set along the remodeled heiau, be removed. |
| · Access within the preserve—on the heiau or other areas above the vegetation line—is to be restricted to individuals with cultural affiliation to the sites, or guided by knowledgeable individuals. |
| · Interpretive signs will be set in appropriate, unobtrusive locations, to inform the public about the nature of the site within the preserve, and to notify them of access restrictions. |
| · Sites within the preserve will be periodically monitored by DLNR-SHPD to ensure that no further deterioration affects the sites, and weekly maintenance schedules will be established to care for site, grounds, and interpretive needs. |
Table 3. Preservation Plan Management Tasks (continued)

| Preservation Area B | Establish a protective buffer 5-10 feet wide on the north and south sides of Site 21,218 (the ahupua’a boundary wall).  
|                     | (similar interim and long-term management tasks as for Area A, to be fulfilled).  

| Preservation Area C | Establish a protective buffer of 5-10 feet wide around the perimeter of the punawai (spring). Designation as a SIHPs (Site 21,219) to be determined by DLNR-SHPD.  
|                     | (similar interim and long-term management tasks as for Area A, to be fulfilled).  

| Preservation Area D | Build a kahua (platform) approximately 5x7 feet, paved with ‘ili‘ili (water worn pebbles), and set the Kū‘ula upright, facing the ocean on the Kahua. Establish a protective buffer of 5-10 feet around the perimeter of the Kū‘ula (Site 21,220).  
|                     | (similar interim and long-term management tasks as for Area A, to be fulfilled).  

Upon completion of all site work as described above, DLNR-SHPD shall verify that the plan has been successfully executed.
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