Section 4  Puʻu o Pāpaʻi, Makaweli Ahupuaʻa

4.1 Environmental Setting

4.1.1 Natural Environment

Puʻu o Pāpaʻi is in the ahupuaʻa of Makaweli on the southern portion of the island of Kauaʻi, in the old district or moku of Kona and current district of Waimea (Figure 13 and Figure 14). This large ahupuaʻa of 21,844 acres is bounded on the west by Waimea Ahupuaʻa and on the east by Hanapēpē Ahupuaʻa. At its northern edge it includes part of the Alakai Swamp and runs along the Waimea-Hanalei District border including Mt. Waiʻaleʻale; at its southern edge is the open ocean. A large part of the upper part of Makaweli Ahupuaʻa lies in the Nā Pali - Kona Forest Reserve.

Located approximately 1.5 miles inland from the coast to the southwest the major landforms in the vicinity include Mahinauli Gulch just to the northwest and the small shield volcano of the post-erosional Koloa volcanic series, Puʻu o Pāpaʻi, just to the southeast. The Puʻu o Pāpaʻi project area is located on the drier leeward coast of Kauaʻi, annual rainfall in the project area averages around 20 inches (Giambelluca et al. 1986). Soils within the project area are primarily Makaweli Silty Clay Loam (MgB, MgC, MgD), consisting of well-drained soils weathered from igneous rock in upland areas. There are also small areas of Lihue Gravelly Silty Clay (LIB) within the project area (Figure 15). Topography is fairly level.

4.1.2 Built Environment

The area immediately surrounding the Puʻu o Pāpaʻi project area is largely rural, with the aerial photograph (Figure 16) showing the land being used primarily for agricultural fields (i.e., sugarcane). There is a small town (Kaumakani) less than a mile south of the project area along the Kaumualiʻi Highway, and Hanapēpē Bay is 2.5 miles southeast.
Figure 13. Portion of 1996 U.S.G.S. 7.5-minute topographic Hanapēpē quadrangle, showing the Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i project area
Figure 14. Tax map (TMK): [4] 1-7-006 showing Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i project area location
Figure 15. Soils map, showing location of Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i project area
Figure 16. Aerial photograph, showing location of Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i project area.
4.2 Traditional and Historical Background

4.2.1 Traditional Landscape

Immediately west of Makaweli Ahupua’a (where the current project area is located), is the ahupua’a of Waimea, which is the largest ahupua’a on the island of Kauaʻi. Early accounts within this ahupua’a indicate a coastal settlement pattern. Cultural layers and burials have been recorded along the shore, which is a typical pattern throughout the Hawaiian Islands. In addition to coastal settlement, the fertile Waimea River Valley has the resources to support a substantial population, evidenced by early agricultural settlements. For example, Hammatt and Ida (1993) identified a prehistoric cultural layer (State Site # 50-30-05-4012) in present-day Waimea Town, and the layer was charcoal carbon dated to A.D. 910-1275. In contrast, there has not been as much modern development within the ahupua’a of Makaweli and little previous archaeology has been done, but interpretations of pre-contact land use within Makaweli can be extrapolated from Waimea. Coastal occupation and river valley settlement patterns would have mirrored those in Waimea only on a smaller scale.

4.2.2 Early Historical Accounts

Written accounts of Hawai‘i began when Captain James Cook anchored a mile off shore at Waimea Bay on the southwest side of Kaua‘i on January 20, 1778. While provisioning on this particular excursion, Cook’s party acquired nine tons of water, 60 to 80 pigs, some fowl, potatoes, a small quantity of plantains and taro - all this in exchange for nails and iron pieces. Captain Cook’s first visit to Waimea was brief, but it left a major impact on the small village. Cook’s own lieutenants (Portlock, Dixon, Vancouver) returned to Waimea repeatedly and established it as a major port and entry point. While Waimea may have always been a royal center for the ali‘i of Kaua‘i, this position was greatly reinforced after western contact.

The Russians recognized the importance of Hawai‘i for provisioning their ships along the fur trade route between the Northwest and China. In 1815, a Russian-owned ship full of furs hit a reef and sank off Waimea Bay, Kaua‘i. The crew abandoned ship and was left stranded on Kaua‘i for 2 ½ months. Meanwhile, Kaumuali‘i, paramount chief of Kaua‘i, retrieved the ship’s goods (furs included) and kept them, in spite of the Russians’ objections. Georg Schäffer was sent to Hawai‘i under Russian orders to retrieve the goods as diplomatically as possible. It has been debated whether Schäffer was following orders or whether he acted on his own behalf when he raised the Russian flag on Kaua‘i. An agreement was reached when Kaumuali‘i asked for protection in exchange for a Russian monopoly of the sandalwood trade. Kaumuali‘i agreed to provide 500 men as an army to conquer the other islands and Schäffer was to provide the ships, ammunition, and weapons. An important part of the agreement was that Schäffer would oversee all construction of future forts and trading posts. The Russian fort at Waimea was built by the Russian-American Company in 1816 under the direction of Schäffer. Kamehameha I, hearing of Schäffer’s plans and feeling intimidated by the threat of Russian invasion, sent a message to Kaumuali‘i asking that Schäffer be deported. By June of 1817, Schäffer and his men were forced to leave Kaua‘i (Mills, 1996: 30-37).

Kalanimōkū decided to disregard Kaumuali‘i’s wish that the land not be redistributed. All Kaua‘i lands were seized. Some of the Kaua‘i chiefs, unsatisfied with the lands they currently
held, rebelled and stormed the Russian Fort, where Kahalai‘a had been left in charge. News of the rebellion reached Honolulu and companies of soldiers were sent to Kaua‘i as backup. In the end, the rebel chiefs were defeated and Kalaninomoku agreed to redistribute the lands. It was at this time that Kaua‘i and the rest of the islands were turned over to the child king, Kaukaoulel Kamehameha III (Liholiho Kamehameha II’s younger brother), and Kaikio‘ewa was appointed the new governor (Mills 1996: 265-269). Kaikio‘ewa was an old warrior chief who was the guardian (kahu) of Kaukaoulel.

… Sometime before Kahalai‘a left the fort, the ‘ili of Kaho‘omano in the ahupua‘a of Makaweli was given by Ka‘ahumanu to Kahalai‘a for the use of soldiers stationed at the fort. This land belonged with the fort since the days of Kaumuali‘i and continued to be used by soldiers, or “koa” into the early 1850s. (Mills, 1996: 198-199)

4.2.3 The Māhele

At the Māhele of 1848, Victoria Kamāmalu, younger sister of Kamehameha IV and V, was awarded LCA 7713. The award consisted of 50 ‘āpana or parcels, most of which were whole ahupua‘a. Included in the award was the ahupua‘a of Makaweli. Because she was only 7 years old at the time of the Māhele, her guardians, Mataio Kekuanaō‘a and Ioane ‘Ī‘ī, acted on her behalf. In 1857, Kekuanaō‘a and ‘Ī‘ī, acting as guardians of Victoria Kamāmalu, agreed to a Palapala Ho‘olimalima Kula (lease for kula lands) to a hui (group) of people from Makaweli and Waimea. The group consisted of 120 people who all signed the lease.

At the time of the Māhele in 1848, Waimea Town was the largest settlement on the island. There were 196 land claims registered for Waimea while to the east of Makaweli, in the ahupua‘a of Hanapēpē, 93 land claims were registered. In Makaweli, there were 117 land claims. So as the distance increases from Waimea toward Kōloa the population and number of claims diminish. However, there is a sizable population in Makaweli of soldiers at the fort in Waimea.

The pattern of settlement for Makaweli Ahupua‘a is far from clear. Māhele land claims of the mid 1800’s often offer a good approximation of traditional patterns of land use but this is not the case at Makaweli owing to the nature of Māhele records for this area and changes in land tenure patterns which occurred in the early 1800’s.

The Māhele land documents suggest a pattern of the extensive exploitation of the Waimea-Makaweli-Mokuone river basin. The ahupua‘a of Makaweli is bounded by the Waimea River on the western side at the shore. The Waimea River is fed by the Makaweli River tributary a short distance up the river, and the Makaweli River, in turn, is fed by other streams such as the Mokuone Stream. These are the stream valleys where, at the time of the Māhele, people were settled. Waimea, at this same time, had the greatest population on the Island of Kaua‘i and Makaweli’s land use is closely linked to Waimea, with some claimants living in one place and farming in the other or vice versa. There is a slight preference for a house lot in Waimea, but several have house lots in both ahupua‘a. Visiting ships were probably supplied with food from both districts when they stopped at Waimea Bay.

The fort, at the mouth of the Waimea River on the Makaweli side of the river, had seen action in the rebellion of 1824, when O‘ahu forces put down the uprising against the Kamehameha dynasty. The koa or soldiers at the fort were given lo‘i lands nearby the fort so they could help...
raise their own food. Twenty-two of the Makaweli claims are for fort soldiers, who generally claim a single lo‘i or mo‘o. Most fort soldiers were given land in the ‘ili of Kaho‘omano, with some others in Hakioa both located quite close to the fort.

There are 119 (‘āpana or pieces) in Makaweli awarded claims. Awarded ‘āpana can be seen on the tax maps for the ‘ili of Hakioa, Kaho‘omano, Kakalae, Kaloulu, Kapalawai, Koleakalo Manawai, Pu‘ulima, Wai‘awa‘awa and Waikaia all located along the Waimea River, the Makaweli River or a major western tributary of the Makaweli River.

A major problem in reconstructing Māhele era settlement patterns is that tax maps and other readily available historic maps do not show ‘ili areas for claims or awards in Huakaule, Kahalai, Kahana, Kahola, Kaikolū, Kalā ‘au‘ōkala, Kamaka‘eli‘eli, Kamo‘ouli (Kamo‘oali‘i), Kaneli, Kaohuihilau, Kapuemanu, Kaunuloa, Kiele, Kohiana, Kukuihoehe, Kula‘amokualuli, Kumuiki, Mahaihai (Mahaemae), Manini, Mokuone, Nonopahu, Ololokalau, Olokele, Palaloa, Piliamo‘o, Poleiwale, Uhi‘ula, Waikui or Wailele. It is difficult to understand the entire ahupua‘a settlement pattern when so many of the geographic areas of settlement are unknown. Perhaps these ‘ili were all along the western-most margin of Makaweli as is the case with the geographically identifiable ‘ili but for all we know they may have been widely spread out over Makaweli Ahupua‘a.

Of these 117 claims with 119 ‘āpana, there are 223 lo‘i or mo‘o (which presumably included lo‘i) enumerated. The majority of these lo‘i ‘āpana are in Hakioa (28), Kaho‘omano (26), and Kakalae (23). Thus the vast majority of lo‘i claims were in seaward portions of the Waimea and Makaweli Rivers. There are claims for 31 house lots, and presumably, some or all of the 22 soldiers were still garrisoned at the fort. The house lots tend to be in ‘ili closer to the shore, and some along the rivers.

Claimants of large tracts, such as the ahupua‘a or the 298+ acres for the Mission lands provide information about highly prized fish ponds and salt ponds, but little else about the land within these large areas. Three ali‘i have claims to the entire ahupua‘a, Ahukai wahine, Emelia Keaweamahi, widow of Kaikio’e wa, and M. Kekūana‘a for Victoria Kamāmalu. Victoria receives the land of Makaweli

From our knowledge of Waimea and Hanapēpē, it is probably likely that the land just mauka of the shore provided pili grass for housing and that there were possibly even wetland terraces in other valleys to the west of the Makaweli River, but we have no records. The ali‘i used the Kekupua Fishpond and the Kapalawai area. There were a few salt ponds along the shore. The Māhele records leave us in ignorance about the eastern and central part of the ahupua‘a, but provide us with a very detailed record of the western end of Makaweli, which was extensively cultivated along the Waimea-Makaweli-Mokuone river valleys.

The Māhele land use pattern at Makaweli was very strongly focused along the seaward portion of the Waimea-Makaweli-Mokuone river valleys. In the general absence of historic or archaeological accounts about the eastern and central part of the ahupua‘a we are left only with conjecture. It seems likely that the creation of a Waimea mission station, a major trade center and a fortification at Waimea drew people in from the surrounding country. It seems probable that habitation and agriculture were more spread out throughout Makaweli Ahupua‘a in pre-contact times. It does appear likely, however, that the westernmost margin of Makaweli was always the most populous portion of the ahupua‘a owing to the well-watered flatlands of the Waimea-
Makaweli-Mokuone river valleys. Thus, to the extent that the historic record truly reflects settlement patterns, we can only assume that there was remarkably little Hawaiian activity at the present Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i study area (Figure 17).

4.2.4 Ranching and Agriculture

In 1831, ranching was introduced to Kaua‘i when Richard Charlton, the British consul, leased some land in the Hanalei district. He started with a herd of about 100 head of cattle. Other ranchers followed suit and in 1848 the practice of registering brands to distinguish ownership of cattle was started on Kaua‘i. Kaumuali‘i’s favorite wife, Deborah Kapule, kept a large herd along the Wailua River (Ronck, 1985: 57). It’s apparent, according to articles in Hawaiian language newspapers of the time, that “wild cattle” were a problem on all the islands even in the late 1800’s. By 1899, wild cattle as well as goats had become a big problem on Kaua‘i. Notes from Henry Pratt Judd of a hunting trip to Makaweli indicate that over a 2-day period a total of 180 goats and 11 cattle were shot (Judd manuscript, Kaua‘i Historical Society).

4.2.4.1 Sugar

In 1835, Ladd and Company started the first successful sugar plantation in Hawai‘i at Kōloa, Kaua‘i. William Ladd, William Hooper and Peter Brinsmade took out a fifty-year lease on 980 acres of land at Kōloa from Kamehameha III. As other sugar plantations were organized, more labor was needed to work the fields. Plantation owners began recruiting laborers from outside the Hawaiian Islands. The Chinese were the first to arrive in 1852, followed by the Japanese in 1868 and Portuguese workers in 1878.

The Hawaiian Sugar Company was founded at Makaweli Ahupua‘a shortly after the signing of the Reciprocity treaty of 1876 by representatives of the Scottish Mirlees, Watson & Yaryan Company. Samuel T. Alexander and Henry P. Baldwin took over the plantation, incorporating it in 1889 (Conde and Best 1973:134). A large mill was established at present day Kaumakani Town and approximately a dozen camps for sugar workers were scattered amongst the fields.

4.2.5 The Sinclair-Robinson-Gay Legacy

The Sinclair’s arrived in Honolulu in 1863 and immediately began looking for large tracts of land to purchase. Disappointed with what they saw, the family decided to head for California in search of better prospects. King Kamehameha IV, hearing of their plans to leave, offered them the island of Ni‘ihau. Unusually heavy rainfall was recorded for 1861-63 and Ni‘ihau was exceptionally lush and green when the two Sinclair brothers, Francis and James, did a site inspection of the island. Excited at their discovery, they hoped to re-establish the cattle and sheep business they had left behind in New Zealand. The two brothers accepted the King’s offer and purchased the island of Ni‘ihau for $10,000 in gold. There they raised Merino sheep and Shorthorn cattle from the continental United States, Australia, and New Zealand.

In 1865, Eliza Sinclair purchased the ahupua‘a of Makaweli (21,844 ac.) from Victoria Kamāmalu Ka‘ahumanu for $15,000. A new home was built in the cool uplands at about 1800 ft. elevation that became known as the “Makaweli house” and sometime in the early 1870’s the Sinclair family moved from Ni‘ihau to settle there. Their Makaweli lands remained otherwise undeveloped (Figure 17).
Figure 17. 1878 Government Survey map by W.D. Alexander, showing location of the Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i project area
In 1889, Francis Gay and Aubrey Robinson formed the family partnership known today as Gay and Robinson (G&R). Through this partnership, the various family businesses, i.e., Makaweli Ranch and Makaweli Plantation were managed. By the early 1880’s the Robinsons became involved in the sugar business not only by planting their own crops, but also by leasing large tracts of land to Hawaiian Sugar Company. The Robinsons were always looking for new and creative ways to utilize their land. For many years, they raised bees for honey and experimented with other agricultural crops.

4.2.6 1900s to present

By the early 1930s, about 670 acres of land was cultivated by the Waimea Sugar Mill Company. Most of Waimea Town's commercial buildings were constructed during this period of the sugar industry's growth.

Following World War II, the fortunes of the Waimea Company changed. The Waimea mill stopped operating in 1945, though the Waimea Sugar Company continued to cultivate cane on its lands until 1969. After the company closed, its fields were leased to the Kekaha Sugar Company.

During recent decades, growth in Waimea has focused on development of the former sugar plantation lands and structures into tourist-oriented facilities. In the current project area, land use appears to have remained much the same since the turn of the century (Figure 18 and Figure 19). Cattle ranching continues, and surrounding lands are used either as cattle pasture or are under sugarcane cultivation.

As discussed previously, the settlement pattern in the mid-nineteenth century, as far as we can reconstruct it from Māhele land documents, was remarkably focused on the westernmost margin of Makaweli along the well-watered flatlands of the Waimea-Makaweli-Mokuone river valleys. The Robinson’s residences in the uplands (the “Makaweli house” was built circa 1870) and along the coast (the “Kapalawai house” was built circa 1890) were two small population foci but the major habitation areas of the last hundred years were the result of the development of the sugar industry.

The Hawaiian Sugar Company established eleven or twelve small camps scattered among their fields in Makaweli Ahupu’a around the turn of the century (including camps numbered 1-10, Makaweli Camp and Pakara Camp; Figure 18). The town of Kaumakani grew up from the settlements around the sugar mill known as “Makaweli Camp” and “Camp 1”. Pakala Village grew up from “Pakara Camp”, and Kaawanui Village grew up from “Camp 6”. All trace of most of the other camps has disappeared from modern maps (Figure 19).
Figure 18. Portion of 1910 U.S. Geological Survey, showing Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i project area

Figure 18. Portion of 1910 U.S. Geological Survey, showing Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i project area
Figure 19. Portion of 1963 U.S. Geological Survey showing Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i project area
4.3 Previous Archaeological Research

The following discussion summarizes previous archaeological research near the Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i project area (Figure 20 and Table 3).

4.3.1 Early Archaeological Research

An early archaeological site survey of Kaua‘i was performed by Wendell Bennett. His findings were published in *The Archaeology of Kaua‘i* in 1931. Bennett credits the earlier work performed by Thomas Thrum, who identified *heiau* sites throughout the Hawaiian Islands; much of Bennett’s efforts were focused on relocating the sites noted by Thrum. While Bennett did locate several sites in the vicinity of the current project area it should be pointed out that most of these sites were further inland. The sites identified by Bennett performed a variety of functions.

Bennett discusses the source of stones for use in *heiau* construction. In this passage reference is made to Makaweli:

> There is considerable mythological and some traditional evidence that the stones for building heiaus were carried great distances. Rice (46, p. 35.) records the legends that the heiaus of Elekuna, Polihale, Kapa-ula, Malae and Poliahu were all built by the Menehunes with stones brought from Makaweli. The archaeological evidence, however, does not substantiate these beliefs. Although some of the stones of a famous temple might have been taken to be built into a new temple, a practice recorded for other parts of Polynesia, especially Tahiti, most of the heiaus were constructed from the stones in their immediate vicinity. In fact no heiau examined was constructed of stones foreign to its locality. (Bennett, 1931:40)

In another passage a reference to Makaweli as a place of refuge is established:

> The following sites, all associated with *heiaus*, are described as "places of refuge" (*pu‘uhonua*): (1) Hikinaakala in Waimea, regarding which Thrum says, "Some report it as a place of refuge, while others assert that the crossing of the river to Makaweli was the only *pu‘uhonua* of this section of ancient Kaua‘i." (It is interesting to note that a *pu‘uhonua* could possibly be a river crossing.) (Bennett 1931: 49)

The two sites Bennett identified closest to the project area are listed below (see Figure 20):

Site 44. Aakukui *heiau*, located in Makaweli at east branch of Kekupua valley near junction. Described by Thrum as, "A paved and walled heiau in good preservation." (Bennett 1931: 111)

Site 48. Kuwiliwili *heiau*. Said to have been located just below Makaweli Camp 3, which site is now in the cane fields. Thrum describes this heiau as, “A large, high walled enclosure of pookanaka class now destroyed”. At the location mentioned there is nothing to indicate a structure but a pile of rocks gathered from a cane field. (Bennett 1931: 112)
Figure 20. Previous archaeological research near the Pu’u o Pāpa’i project area
Table 3. Previous Archaeological Studies near Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i project area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Type of Investigation</th>
<th>General Location</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thrum 1907</td>
<td>Heiau Study</td>
<td>Hawaiian Islands</td>
<td>Briefly describes several sites, including <em>heiau</em> in Makaweli Ahupua‘a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett 1931</td>
<td>Island-wide Survey</td>
<td>Kaua‘i</td>
<td>Briefly describes several sites, including <em>heiau</em> identified by Thrum in Makaweli Ahupua‘a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCoy 1972</td>
<td>Inventory survey</td>
<td>Fort Elisabeth</td>
<td>First detailed testing in and around Fort Elisabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hommon et al. 1975</td>
<td>Inventory survey</td>
<td>Fort Elisabeth</td>
<td>Identified a possible <em>imu</em> and two burials in trenches X-13 and X-14 south of the Russian Fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahon 1993</td>
<td>Inadvertent burial discovery</td>
<td>Kapalawai, north of Robinson Landing harbor</td>
<td>Inadvertent burial discovery, Site 50-30-09-6011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills 1996</td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>Fort Elisabeth</td>
<td>Dissertation focuses on ethnohistory and archaeological findings at the fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulick et al. 2000</td>
<td>Inventory survey</td>
<td>Kapalawai, Robinson estate</td>
<td>6 sites recorded, including Kekupua fishpond, historic sites, and one subsurface cultural layer including a burial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDermott &amp; Hammatt 2001</td>
<td>Addendum to inventory survey</td>
<td>Kapalawai, Robinson estate</td>
<td>Added several features to previously recorded historic properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammatt and Shideler 2006</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring Plan</td>
<td>Kapalawai, Robinson estate</td>
<td>Monitoring, preservation, and burial treatment plans for the historic properties located in the Zulich et al 2000 AIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the map in Bennett’s volume is not very detailed, none of the sites he describes are within the current project area and none appear to be within a mile of the Pu’u o Pāpa’i project area. Several *heiau* recorded by Thrum on Kaua’i could not, however, be relocated by Bennett and their locations remain uncertain:

- Site 8. Peeamoa *heiau*, Makaweli. Described by Thrum as "An unwalled heiau." (Bennett 1931: 152)
- Site 9. Kapakaniau *heiau*, Makaweli. Described by Thrum as "A paved, open platform heiau; in good condition." (Bennett 1931: 152)
- Site 10. Naulili *heiau*, in Makaweli. Described by Thrum as, "An unwalled sacred place; flat ground." (Bennett 1931: 152)

With the exception of Aakukui Heiau, three *heiau* that had been identified in 1886 by a local informant in 1886 named Kanakahelelā, were not located by Bennett.

1. Aakukui was a heiau that stood at Kekupua.
2. Kaumuloa was another.
3. Kuanalili was another.

These were *heiaus* in which human sacrifices were offered, but Kuanalili had a *lele* altar, that is, a high place on which to lay the victims. When the *kahuna* thought that it was the proper time, then the victims were carried to Aakukui or to Kaumuloa. Kapuahi and Aimoku were priests who officiated in these *heiaus*. There were more priests but these were the principal ones. Kaumuali‘i was the chief to whom these *heiaus* belonged. There are no other places of importance there (Lahainaluna Student Papers).

House sites were also a common feature lining the rivers in Makaweli and Waimea. The houselots located by Bennett were found further up the valleys close to agricultural sites:

There is a brief mention of a *hōlua* slide in Makaweli: “A hill named Puuholua in Makaweli was probably another slide” (Bennett 1931:55). There was no site number designation.

### 4.3.2 More Recent Archaeological Research

Very few archaeological studies have been undertaken in Makaweli Ahupua’a (outside of Fort Elisabeth some 5 km distant), as compared to neighboring Waimea and Hanapēpē, probably primarily due to the lack of any larger towns being developed in the ahupua’a.

McMahon (1993) assessed the inadvertent discovery of a coastal burial. State Site # 50-30-09-6011 is located just south of the inlet of Mahinauli Gulch, and just north of the Robinson landing barge harbor in Makaweli town. The discovery exposed a cultural deposit including midden and basalt debitage. It was unclear whether the burial was of a traditional Hawaiian date or historic.

In 1999 and 2000, Cultural Surveys Hawaii (Zulick et al. 2000 and McDermott & Hammatt 2001) performed an archaeological inventory survey of the 170-acre Robinson parcel at coastal Kapalawai. During the inventory survey, 6 sites were recorded: State Site # 50-30-9-762 is a series of rock walls and a terrace; State Site # 50-30-9-763 is a stone platform; State Site # 50-30-9-764 is a housing complex consisting of 14 historic buildings; State Site # 50-30-9-765 is the
6-acre Kekupua Fishpond; State Site # 50-30-9-766 is a Portuguese brick oven; and State Site # 50-30-9-792 is a subsurface cultural layer, which includes a human burial. McDermott & Hammatt (2001) is an addendum to the inventory survey report that records several new features of previously identified sites, and Hammatt and Shideler 2006 consists of the archaeological monitoring plan for development of the area.
4.4 Assessment

4.4.1 Historic Properties within the Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i project area

There are no known archaeological sites in the proposed Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i location or within approximately a mile. However, this is somewhat complicated by the fact that no archaeological studies have been done within the project area. The aerial photograph (see Figure 16) and historical research show that the Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i location has been impacted by agricultural activity probably going back to the 1880s. Overall, the chance of highly significant surface archaeological finds within the project area is rather low, primarily due to historic disturbance.

4.4.2 Historic Properties within one mile of the Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i location

No known historic sites are located within one mile of the Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i location (see Figure 20). The few recorded archaeological sites within a two mile radius are along the coast or in Kekupua Valley.

4.4.3 Summary

The project area contains no known historic properties and, although no archaeological inventory survey has been done within the parcel, there is low probability of there being highly significant historic properties in the area. Likewise, there are no known historic properties within one mile of the project area, and development of the site would not impact any known historic properties (see Figure 20). Archaeological work in the surrounding area has revealed both pre-contact and historic sites as well as several burials, but the majority of these sites are located near the shoreline, rather than inland (where the project area is located). As the aerial photography (see Figure 16) shows, the Pu‘u o Pāpa‘i location has been heavily impacted by agricultural activity and the likelihood of either surface or subsurface archaeological findings is suggested to be minimal. Therefore, our assessment indicates that any historic properties that may be present would likely require no costly or time-consuming mitigation measures.