MINUTES (DRAFT)
FOR THE MEETING OF THE
HAWAI‘I BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

DATE: November 21, 2013
TIME: 1:00 pm
PLACE: Leiopapa A. Kamehameha Building
       Office of Planning, 6th Floor Conference Room
       235 S. Beretania Street
       Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

AGENDA ITEM 1: Call to Order

Kamanao Mills, Chairperson of the Hawai‘i Board on Geographic Names (HBGN or Board), called the meeting to order at 1:05 pm.

The following were in attendance:

MEMBERS: Kalani Akana (Office of Hawaiian Affairs), Betty Kam (Bernice P. Bishop Museum), Holly McEldowney (Department of Land and Natural Resources), Kamanao Mills (Department of Hawaiian Home Lands), Ryan Morales (Land Survey Division), and Noenoe Silva (University of Hawai‘i)

ABSENT: Joan Delos Santos (Office of Planning)

ADVISOR: Renee Louis, PhD., Naomi Losch (University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, retired)

OTHERS: Dennis Kim (Office of Planning)

AGENDA ITEM 2: Approval of Meeting Minutes of September 19, 2013

A motion to approve the September 19, 2013 meeting minutes was made by Ms. Betty Kam and seconded by Ms. Noenoe Silva. The Board approved the motion unanimously.

Mr. Kamanao Mills requested that the Board amend the agenda by considering Agenda Item #4 before Item #3 because Mr. Bobby Camara was already available on the telephone. Ms. Kam moved and Ms. Silva seconded the motion to amend the agenda accordingly. The motion was passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Public Inquiry Regarding Selected Place Names within Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, with Background and Introduction by Mr. Bobby Camara (via telephone)

Mr. Mills introduced Mr. Camara via telephone and explained that the spread sheet distributed to the Board included Hawai‘i Island place names that Mr. Camara would like to discuss with the Board.
Mr. Camara began by clarifying that he no longer works at Hawai‘i Volcanoes Nation Park. He did work there on and off for 30 years but officially retired at the end of June. He initially contacted Ms. Joan Delos Santos because he was told that the names Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa were now being spelt as one word. He edits publications for the Hawai‘i Pacific Parks Association and needs to understand current conventions for spelling Hawaiian place names. Ms. Delos Santos emailed him a place name list dated 2012 which he understood was sent to the U.S. Board of Geographic Names (BGN). He went to the BGN website and saw that its list had not been updated with decisions made by the Hawai‘i Board of Geographic Names (HBGN). He wanted to know whether he should use names on the HBGN list in publications or those on the BGN list. Mr. Camara confirmed that the list distributed to Board for today’s discussion was taken from the HBGN list sent by Ms. Delos Santos. He has highlighted those that he wished to discuss for various reasons.

The following are the place names the Board discussed with Mr. Camara:

- Kipukakekake: The name should have kahakō over the first “i”, as in the word kīpuka, and over the first “e”, as in the word ēkake. It would read Kīpukakēkake which translates to donkey kīpuka.
- Puʻuwaʻawaʻa: This place is listed as being on the Kahuku Ranch quadrangle. This is probably an error because Pu'uwa'awa'a is on the Kiholo quadrangle and he does not know of any Pu'uwa'awa'a in Kahuku.
- Kīpukapepeiau: He believes this name probably ends in an “o” instead of a “u” as it probably means “ear”. He could not find a Hawaiian word “pepeiau”.
- Kamakaiʻa Uka and Kamakaiʻa Waena: He understood that uka and waena are separate in these cases because they indicate a relative location and are not part of the place name itself. Mr. Mills and Ms. Renee Louis confirmed that his understanding was correct.
- Keahole Southwest Substation: He believes there should be a kahakō over the “a”.
- Kūkiʻo Bay: The bay now called Kūkiʻo should be Uluweuweu as that is how it is labeled on the old maps from the late 1800s.
- Kīpuka Mizotas: He found this name puzzling because Mizota is a person’s name and he thought it should be Mizota’s Kīpuka instead. He was wondering if there were conventions for this. Ms. Louis confirmed that it had been Mizota’s originally. Mr. Camara clarified that the kīpuka is in the saddle between Hualālai and Mauna Loa above Kealakekua School.
- Kūlua: He was wondering why Puʻukulua was changed to Kūlua with the Pu‘u removed.
- Halemaʻumaʻu: Mr. Camara asked if the Board could make an exception for this name. For 20 years, Ms. Pua Kanahele has sat on the Hawai‘i Volcanoes National Park’s kupuna advisory group. He remembers the group discussing how individuals would pronounce this name differently, often depending on where they were from or that person’s family or even what is happening in the crater at that moment. If there is no eruption, then maybe it is Halema‘uma‘u which might be house made of or surrounded by ‘amaʻu fern. If there is an eruption, it would be Halemaumau or, according to one translation, the “Home of Eternal Fire”. Ms. Kanahele’s thought, one she repeated over the years, was that all diacritical marks should be left off this name because there are various traditions associated with this very important feature and it should be up to the individual to say it however they wished. Mr. Camara appreciates the term “crater”
being deleted from the name because it is not technically a crater. This raises another issue. Kīlauea is not a crater but a caldera. He mentioned a number of other problematic names in that area, but was not sure whether these fall under the Board’s jurisdiction. To address the issue of Halemaʻumaʻu, Mr. Camara asked if the Board would like a letter from Ms. Kanahele or an official request to consider the name. Mr. Mills said it would be helpful if Ms. Kanahele were to send a letter. Ms. Louis noted that this would be a spelling correction and not a name change which is not a major correction. It is, however, a major discussion. Mr. Mills noted that this issue has come up before and the Board would welcome any evidence or leads that would help the deliberations.

Mr. Mills thanked Mr. Camara for contacting the Board and believes all his suggestions merit consideration. Mr. Camara clarified that he was not expecting the Board to make decisions on his recommendations immediately. He has not gone through the whole list. He only highlighted those he noticed because he knows these places already. Ms. Louis encouraged him to review the entire Hawaiʻi Island list. He said that he doesn’t know all areas of the island but he can be an effected proofreader.

Mr. Camara returned to his initial and major question of whether this list is an official list that is just waiting to be entered in the GNIS. The second question was whether or not Mauna Loa and Mauna Kea needed to be spelt as one word on federal publications. Ms. Louis clarified that place names on the lists posted on the HBGN website have been reviewed by the Board. Ms. Delos Santos is currently looking into how many of these names have been approved by the BGN and are officially entered into the GNIS. Federal agencies are required to use place names as they appear in the GNIS in any documents they publish. This would be at the time of publication. The BGN generally accepts recommendations made by the HBGN, but it can take time for this to happen. The BGN generally adopts and enters places names in one step and reviews the names in large groups. The HBGN could ask when the BGN anticipates reviewing and entering names and advise those preparing documents for publication accordingly. The Board might be able to predict when those names would become official. Ms. Delos Santos has contacted the BGN on the updates and the response was that staff would look into it.

Mr. Mills asked Ms. Louis if the Board can act now on the names Mr. Camara identified. Mr. Louis confirmed that the Board can continue to submit recommendations at any time and include addition groups of names to the ones being considered. She understands that a list was sent to the BGN in May but she is not sure which names were sent or which the BGN may be considering. Mr. Mills asked that the names identified by Mr. Camara be placed on the agenda for the next Board meeting.

Ms. Silva asked if the Board had officially decided to combine the name components of Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa. Ms. Louis confirmed that they had. When the issue was first considered, the Board decided not to combine the names because it wanted to spare agencies the expense of changing such prominent names. Later the Board realized that signs do not need to be changed immediately but only when signs are replaced or new ones made. The reason for combining the names was that Hawaiians do not think of them as two words such as “White Mountain”. They think of it as one name, Maunakea or Maunaloa. It is not like Uka
or Waena which are geographic designations. Mr. Kalani Akana noted that these two names are separated in the Hawaiian Dictionary. Ms. Silva added that they are also separated in many of the old writings. Mr. Mills asked if combining the name components in these two cases follows the conventions recommended by the ‘Ahahui ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i. Ms. Louis confirmed that it did. Ms. Naomi Losch brought a copy of the 1978 guidelines and copies were distributed to the Board. Ms. Louis said the guidelines will be posted on the website to help the public understand how Board decisions are made. Ms. Losch participated in the 1978 meetings that resulted in the recommendations and confirmed that not everyone in the group agreed with every recommendation. Contention still exists over its use and any group is free to convene for any reason and propose new recommendations. Mr. Camara thought that it could be confusing to combine these particular names because they are so prominent and people are so accustomed to seeing them separated. Some people say it is not Mauna Kea but Mauna a Wakea. In Hawai‘i Volcanoes National Park, there is the pali named Hilina Pali. Would that be changed to Pali Hilina if the conventions are to be followed? Ms. Louis acknowledged these are good questions and it is up to the Board to make those decisions. The Board needs to weigh different and sometimes competing principles when making decisions. The Board can decide to follow common usage by the people of that place, but there is also Hawaiian language grammatical correctness to consider.

Mr. Camara raised differences he has seen in the pronunciation of Pu‘uwa‘awa‘a. In the Boundary Commission testimony, the name is abbreviated to Puawaa. This could reflect common usage or just the transcriber of the testimony. There are many other examples of these kinds of variations. Ms. Silva pointed out that names can be recorded as variants in the GNIS so these differences are not lost. Mr. Camara offered to go through the Hawaii Island list for any errors or potential corrections he might notice. Mr. Mills encourage him to do this and stressed how helpful his assistance would be. He explained that when the Board feels uncomfortable making a decision, for whatever reason, the name is classified as needing more research. Often the Board wants to understand the historical context of the name if possible.

Mr. Camara brought up the issue of names given the underwater volcanoes south of Hawai‘i Island and summarized what he knows of their naming. In 1955, a man named Emory, not Kenneth Emory of the Bishop Museum, prepared a map of the ocean floor off of Hawai‘i Island. He discovered five different seamounts and described them in a letter to Mrs. Pukui. The names received were descriptive such as ‘Āpu‘upu‘u which means bumpy and Lō‘ihi which means long. Ms. Kanahele and members of her family think that Kama‘ehu might be more appropriate for Lō‘ihi. Mr. Camara asked what the procedure is for submitting new names and what documentation is needed. Ms. Louis explained that there is only one form for all requests and the applicant would check the “New Name” box on the form. Lō‘ihi may not be in the GNIS and, if not, any request for that feature would be a new name.

Mr. Mills reiterated that the corrections and suggestions identified by Mr. Camara would be placed on the agenda of the next meeting for discussion and decision-making. Mr. Camara suggested that the HBGN website have more explanatory notes on the status to the lists and when lists were last updated. Ms. Louis pointed out that the next agenda item for today’s meeting is to discuss how the Board can make the place name lists and decision-making process more accessible to the public. Mr. Camara requested to be notified of the next meeting.
Mr. Kalani Akana asked if it were possible for this Board to revisit the previous decision to combine Maunakea and Maunaloa. Ms. Louis confirmed that the Board can revisit previous decisions. Mr. Mills sought clarification on which guidelines were used when making that decision. He thought there may have been guidelines prepared specifically for the Board’s use that were not necessarily identical to the “Recommendations of the ‘Aha ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i” (Hawaiian Spelling Project, 1978). Ms. Losch remembers there being only one document and that was the ‘Aha ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i recommendations. The one Mr. Mills remembers was from the 1990 or 2000.

Mr. Akana thought that the Board had guidelines covering the decision-making process and sources considered. In one of those sources, Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa are written separately. Ms. Louis reiterated the history behind the Board’s original decision. Mr. Akana pointed out Rules #6 (i.e., single word modifier) and #12 (i.e., proper names modifier) in the ‘Aha ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i recommendations. Ms. Silva said that the examples given in Rule 12, Koʻolau Poko and Koʻolaulo Loa, are now normally written as one word. Ms. Losch noted that she is from Koʻolaloa and “loa” is part of Koʻolau so it is one word.

Mr. Mills agreed that the Board should revisit this decision because it predates the terms of most current Board members. The Board will do the best it can after reviewing and comparing existing guidance documents and conventions. Ms. Kam noted that a large number of decisions were made over the years based on conventions calling for name components to be combined. If the Board were to change its approach now, it would be a major change that could potentially affect many decisions. Ms. Louis said that Board has been consistent in giving weight to community usage, particularly that of knowledgeable community elders. This knowledge takes precedents over standard guidelines or references. Ms. Silva pointed out that a “Note” on page 3 of the ‘Aha ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i recommendations cautions that there is a “Fine Line of Choice” when making these kinds of decisions. Mr. Mills said he wanted to gather and review the various documents used over the years so that we can better understand how and why decisions were made. He will present his findings to the Board. Ms. Louis recalled that Mr. Craig Tasaka, then with the Office of State Planning, suggested that the Board have some rules in order to be more consistent. A small group was formed to address this issue. The group probably met in 1999 as this project to review all place names began in 1998. She remembers the group supporting use of the ‘Aha ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i recommendations as guidelines but with the clear understanding that there would always be exceptions. Mr. Mills said he would try to contact Mr. Nathan Napoka, former Board member, to see if he has any of those documents.

Ms. Louis raised the possibility of contacting those who worked on the ‘Aha ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i recommendations to understand what they were thinking at the time and if their thinking has since changed. Ms. Losch was one of the participants. She recalls the discussions being very structured. Participants were given a set amount of time to express their opinions and a bell was rung if anyone exceeded the time limit. They then voted. Everybody had a say and the majority ruled. For example, they discussed “na” for plural. At that point, “na” did not have a kahakō but “nā wai”, by whom, did. She remembers “na” because she was against using the kahakō for “na”, plural, because she felt that the sound of “nā” in “nā wai” was a bit longer than the “na” for plural. The problem today is that once a kahakō is placed on a word, people
tend to overly stress or lengthen the sound. Some believe it is best not to use a kahakō because people may overdue it. Ms. Kam asked how many institutions use these guidelines. Ms. Losch thought it was primarily for language people. Ms. Kam asked if it is in common use. Ms. Louis said it is still being used in language classes. Ms. Silva remembered that when she was in Hawaiian language classes the ‘Aha Ōlelo Hawai‘i recommendations were referred to all the time and spelling was corrected according to that document. Ms. Losch was not sure if anyone has updated the dictionary using the recommendations but thought that Larry Kimura may have worked on an update. Mr. Akana noted that the recommendations are in the Māmaka Kaiao (Modern Hawaiian Vocabulary). Ms. Losch relayed that Ms. Pat Bacon was unhappy about people changing the Hawaiian Dictionary because they are changing Mrs. Mary Kawena Pukui’s work. It would be better if they produced something separate that is their own work. Ms. Losch believes this is similar to the place name Halema‘uma‘u. Mrs. Pukui pronounced it Halema‘uma‘u. She would give deference to Mrs. Pukui’s pronunciation as she was a native speaker, an elder, and from that area. Ms. Louis noted that Ms. Pua Kanahele has expressed her opposition to the use of diacritical marks on any words, not just Halema‘uma‘u. Mr. Akana point out that the 1986 Hawaiian Dictionary refers to ‘Aha Ōlelo Hawai‘i and the 1978 spelling project. Ms. Silva said that this dictionary is controversial in that it was updated without it being clearly disclosed that it was new edition. Ms. Losch summarized the various editions of the Hawaiian Dictionary she remembers. The first was the Hawaiian-English dictionary that came out in 1957 and then the English-Hawaiian when she was a freshman at the university. Then they combined the two which had a brown cover. The brown one had a section with the different gods and goddesses. This section was removed from the subsequent edition.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Discussion of Names Database Organization and Publication Initiative

Ms. Louis and Mr. Kim began the discussion by demonstrating what is currently available on the HBGN website. Ms. Louis explained that before Mr. Craig Tasaka left, he posted spreadsheets listing decisions made by the Board up to that point. The files are available in Excel or pdf formats. Nothing indicates when the sheets were last updated or changed. She clarified that work done by the Board recently is not available online. No Board decisions have been sent to the BGN for a while either. When Mr. Art Buto was with the Office of Planning, he began to systematically review HBGN operations and look for ways to standardize the process. Ms. Delos Santos is trying to continue this effort.

Ms. Louis summarized a meeting she recently had with Ms. Delos Santos and Mr. Dennis Kim when a HBGN meeting was cancelled. She provided them with an overview of the project which the Board has been working on since 1998 and how it has evolved over time. One topic discussed was why some Hawai‘i Island place names were sent to the BGN and others were not. Ms. Delos Santos and Mr. Kim are beginning a process of going through the spreadsheets and determining which sets of place names have been sent and which have not. Mr. Kim devised a method for comparing the Board’s finalized list with that currently in the GNIS. He reviewed Kaua‘i Island names as a test case and found 53 names that were corrected by the HBGN but have not been entered in the GNIS. Ms. Louis clarified that only corrected names are sent to the BGN. If a name has no diacritical marks and the Board decides that this is correct, then that name is submitted as a correction because a decision was
made and submitting it creates a record of this decision. Names determined to need more research are not submitted.

Mr. Kim illustrated the process he used by showing the Board his comparison between the HBGN list of corrected Kaua‘i Island place names and what is currently listed in the GNIS. He pointed out the 53 corrections that had not been entered into the GNIS. Ms. Louis explained that part of the delay in updating the GNIS is due to cut backs at the BGN and the resulting need to prioritize work. The BGN has given priority to correcting names that appear on topographic maps and not names that are just in the GNIS. In the case of the Kaua‘i place names, however, all 53 corrected names were on topographic maps at some point. The BGN is also only updating names for natural features and not those in the build environment (e.g., buildings or schools). The HBGN might consider specifically asking the BGN to correct names applying to a broader range of feature types for Hawai‘i. For example, homestead lands and schools would not be corrected and would therefore not officially have diacritical marks. This request could also ask that the BGN allow use of the state’s official list when projects or facilities are federally funded or on federal lands. Mr. Kim will run comparisons for the other island as well. This will include only names that the HBGN reviewed, corrected, and submitted.

At their meeting, they also decided that it would be useful for the public to create and post at least five separate place names lists. These lists would include: 1) names that need more research; 2) names reviewed, corrected and submitted to the BGN; 3) names currently under consideration; 4) non-Hawaiian names; and 5) a compilation of all names appearing in the individual lists. All lists would be arranged by island. They though having a list of all the place names needing more research would be particularly useful because it would hopefully encourage and enable the public to provide input on these names and therefore help the Board gather the information needed to make sound decisions. The list of corrected names will be those on which the Board rendered a decision although these names may not have been corrected by the BGN. The list of those under consideration would be updated monthly. The public would know that these names have not been submitted to the BGN yet because the Board is still working on them. The compilation list would allow those looking for a particular name to search only one list without having to search each separate list. The status of each name would be noted (e.g., “more research”) next to the name. The list of non-Hawaiian names includes features such as Wilson Tunnel. The Board has not been reviewing these under the current project. Hopefully if all this information is more accessible, more people will learn about the Board’s work and will be encouraged to participate. The Board’s work could go more quickly if it is not just the Board doing all the background work and with just the resources available to each Board member. The Board’s discussion with Mr. Camara earlier in the meeting is an example of what the public can contribute. The Board agreed that this approach would be very useful.

Mr. Mills asked if other states have similar difficulties. Ms. Louis said that many do not because most place names are in English. Some states do not recognize native names while others do. Oklahoma, for example, does. In Oregon and Washington, the process is in flux at the moment. In Idaho, the Coer d’Alene Tribe has been successful at mediating the use of its names with groups around them. Those states with large native populations often struggle to
get their place names officially recognized. None of them have the kind of spelling corrections like Hawai‘i.

AGENDA ITEM 5: Discussion of Maui Island Place Names

The Board reviewed a total of nine place names on the Maui place name list. As with previous meetings, this list includes names that are in the GNIS but were not entered into the HBGN’s working spreadsheets created when the HBGN began its review of all the Hawai‘i USGS Quads. The board’s decisions are as follows:

No Change:
- Place Names of Hawaii: The Board determined that the following four place names do not need changing because they are in Place Names of Hawaii: Kaulanapueo Church; Kaunoa School; and Kawaipapa Stream which is entered twice in the GNIS (i.e., appears as two names). Mr. Akana noted that the school may no longer exist.
- Hawai‘i Place Names: The Board concurred with the following two names although they are not in Place Names of Hawaii. They are in Clark’s Hawai‘i Place Names. Clark’s Beaches of Maui is given as the source for these GNIS entries:
  - Kauapo: The Board believed Clark’s explanation for this name is convincing and agreed it would not require the addition of diacritical marks. The name appears to refer to a wharf that was at this location prior to the 1946 tsunami. Uapo is the Hawaiian word for wharf.
  - Kaulahao: The Board agreed that the lack of diacritical marks in this name was reasonable based on Hawaiian language usage and the absence of any viable alternatives that would have diacritical marks. Clark gives the literal translation as “iron chain”

- Hawaii Board of Geographic Names: The Board reconfirmed its 1999 decisions on the following two names: Kaulupō and Kawilinau. Both names were recorded by Kenneth Emory in his survey of Haleakalā Crater in 1920.

More Research Needed: One name was determined to need more research:
- Kauiaha: This name is listed as a variant in the GNIS for Kuiaha Gulch. Neither name appears in Place Names of Hawaii. It is written without diacritical marks in Clark’s Hawai‘i Place Names and with an ‘okina, as Kui‘aha, in Atlas of Hawai‘i (3rd edition). More research was considered appropriate due to uncertainty over the use of an ‘okina.

AGENDA ITEM 5: Adjourn

The Board decided not to meet in the month of December and agreed to schedule the next meeting on January 16, 2014. Mr. Akana moved to adjourn and Ms. McEldowney seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion. The meeting adjourned at 2.50 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Holly McEldowney
MINUTES (DRAFT)
FOR THE MEETING OF THE
HAWAI‘I BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

DATE: January 16, 2014
TIME: 1:00 pm
PLACE: Leiopapa A. Kamehameha Building
Office of Planning, 6th Floor Conference Room
235 S. Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

AGENDA ITEM 1: Call to Order

Mr. Kamanao Mills, Chairperson of the Hawai‘i Board on Geographic Names (HBGN or Board), called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

The following were in attendance:

MEMBERS: Kalani Akana (Office of Hawaiian Affairs), Joan Delos Santos (Office of Planning), Betty Kam (Bernice P. Bishop Museum), Holly McEldowney (Department of Land and Natural Resources), Kamanao Mills (Department of Hawaiian Home Lands), Ryan Morales (Land Survey Division), and Noenoe Silva (University of Hawai‘i)

ADVISOR: Renee Louis, PhD., Naomi Losch (University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, retired)

OTHERS: Dennis Kim (Office of Planning), Nick Belluzzo (State Historic Preservation Division), and Melia Lane-Kamahele (National Park Service)

AGENDA ITEM 2: Approval of Meeting Minutes of November 21, 2013

Ms. Holly McEldowney, HBGN Secretary, explained that the minutes were not ready for distribution although a draft was completed and will be distributed for comment shortly.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Status of HBGN Names Database Organization and Publication Initiative

Ms. Joan Delos Santos reported that she and Ms. Renee Louis were developing a new coding scheme for the names database. This should make it easy to find the status of a given place name and the decisions made. Once done, the spreadsheets will be posted on the HBGN website. They are in the process of converting the spreadsheets to include these new codes. This should be ready by the next meeting. During this process, they determined that in May of 2012 the HBGN submitted 1,400 names to the U.S. Board of Geographic Names (BGN) for consideration. They also realized that 40 names were missed at the time so those will be submitted today. The next step will be comparing names on the
spreadsheets with those entered in the Geographic Names Information System (GNIS) to determine which submitted names were officially changed in the GNIS and which were not. If a name has not been change, they will try to find out why. It may be that the BGN has not gotten to it yet. Once this is done, the revised spreadsheet will be posting on the HGBN website along with descriptions of what the HGBN does, its methodology, and the place name initiative that has been underway for the last 10 or 12 years. Hopefully this will be posted in February or March.

**AGENDA ITEM 4: Request from National Park Service to Reconsider HBGN Decision on ‘Ohe‘o**

Ms. Delos Santos provided some background on previous decisions made pertaining to the series of pools, once called Seven Sacred Pools, in Kīpahulu District, which is part of Haleakalā National Park. The initial request to change the name of these pools dates to the 1970s and the issue was raised again in the 1990s. The issue was not entirely resolved. At its meeting of February 28, 2013, the HBGN decided to recommend the name ‘Ohe‘o. The National Park Service (NPS) was not officially notified of this decision. The BGN contacted NPS before officially considering the HBGN recommendation and discovered that NPS did not support the change. The BGN did not act on the recommendation and is now asking if the HBGN is willing to reconsider its recommendations. Ms. Melia Lane-Kamahela, NPS, explained that opinions on this name have evolved over the years with changes in park management.

Ms. Natalie Gates, Haleakalā National Park Superintendent, and Ms. Polly Angelakis, Chief of Interpretation, joined the discussion by conference call. Mr. Mills began by asking if Haleakalā National Park has a proposed name it recommends. Ms. Angelakis responded that they prefer the name “Pools of ‘Ohe‘o”. Ms. Delos Santos said that she talked to Ms. Jennifer Runyon at BGN who advised HBGN to determine exactly which feature the name is referencing when making this decision. Is it ‘Ohe‘o Gulch, valley, pools, or an area? Ms. Naomi Losch replied that it is the vicinity or the area of the pools. She added that she looked up the name in *Sites of Maui* (Sterling 1978) and found one source saying that the full name of the gulch was “Ohe-o-Kapo” and that each pool has a name. As written, it means bamboo of Kapo.

Ms. Delos Santos asked Board members to explain how they decided ‘Ohe‘o was the appropriate name. Ms. Betty Kam remembers the board discussing whether the name applied to the pools, the gulch, or the area. They decided on ‘Ohe‘o because the name appeared to be a geography area encompassing these and other features. Ms. Losch noted that the Board did not include “Pools” because that would not be a Hawaiian name. To clarify the board’s intent, Ms. McEldowney pulled out the meeting minutes for February 28, 2013. The minutes show the Board believing that the name applies the area. Ms. Louis felt the BGN is confused because they are accustomed to names being applied to specific features. When BGN staff saw the agenda item referencing “Pools”, they expected the HBGN decision to apply to pools and not to the area in which the pools are located.
Ms. Noenoe Silva reviewed more closely the article in *Sites of Maui*. The excerpt is from a 1964 to 1965 newspaper series in the *Maui News*. The full name of the gulch is said to be “Ohe-o-Kapo” for the goddess Kapo and ‘ohe is bamboo. It also gives each pool a name. It is unfortunate that the Board did not have this reference at hand during the previous discussions. Ms. McEldowney asked if NPS could just use “Pools” as a descriptive term in its materials without having to include it in the official place name of ‘Ohe'o. This would be similar to saying a trail at Haleakalā. Does the name need to be changed to tell people where the pools are? Ms. Lane-Kamahele explained that Haleakalā park staff wanted it to be officially listed as “Pools of ‘Ohe’o” so that it could be easily identified in publications such as maps and brochures. Without the capacity to identify where the pools are, people drive all over the neighborhood getting lost, park in inappropriate places, and ask for directions. If it were on the map, people would be directed specifically to that location. It is a directional issue. Ms. Gates confirmed Ms. Lane-Kamahele’s explanation but added that having readily understandable directions it very important given the number visitors they have, about 800,000 a year, and the fact that many do not speak English. Many also do not check out the website ahead of time or do any research. Park staff needs to reduce the amount of time spent providing visitors with already available information and answering relatively simple questions. If this information is not on the map, visitors will not understand where to go. The best option for NPS is to have “Pools of ‘Ohe’o” on its publications because that is what people look for.

Mr. Kalani Akana asked if NPS was concerned because all its materials and signs currently say “Pools of ‘Ohe’o”. Ms. Gates confirmed that this name is on current park signs and materials. Ms. Kam asked if these need to be reprinted if the HBGN decides the name should be just ‘Ohe’o. Ms. Angelakis confirmed that they would. Ms. Gates clarified that reprinting these materials is not the main issue. The primarily concern is that they would be putting something on a map that is not familiar to people. It was called “Seven Pools of ‘Ohe’o” and then “Pools of ‘Ohe’o” because these names are somewhat descriptive. Getting people to say they want to go to ‘Ohe’o Gulch, or just ‘Ohe’o, will take another seven to ten years of effort.

In her discussion with Ms. Runyon, Ms. Delos Santos asked what weight the BGN gives to local usage as opposed to what a state board thinks is culturally correct. This also includes weighing other factors during the decision making process. Ms. Runyon called it local preference instead of local usage and said that this is generally BGN’s priority. This reflects what people of an area want a place to be called. This is usually the community and not, for example, NPS. Do people of the area want to change it because it has always been printed in a certain way or do they want to change it so it will be correct going forward? If it is on a map, people will start using that name. Sometimes they want to keep it the way it is even if it is incorrect. If a decision is controversial or considered a major change, some state boards will hold public hearings, send out surveys, or write newspaper articles on the pending decision. It is the responsibility of state boards is to find out what people want places to be called. Sometimes decisions are simple and sometimes not. This is the guidance the BGN gives state boards. Ms. Silva suggested that it may be more complicated in Hawai‘i because of the cultural aspect. Ms. Delos Santos said Ms. Runyon
acknowledged the importance of the cultural aspect for Hawai‘i and pointed out that the HBGN does not need to rush its decision.

Ms. Louis announced that she has been contracted by Ala Kuku‘i/Hāna Retreat to work on a community outreach for the East Maui Watershed Partnership. She will be part of an ethnographic project to address water concerns in East Maui. Her role will be mapping place names with the different partners in the area, including the cultural practitioners. One objective is to see if they can better understanding water management from a traditional Hawaiian perspective. Examining place names is part of this exercise. She is hoping to use the approach devised for the previous HBGN place names project which is now being housed at the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. In February she will be giving people involved in the project an overview of names currently on the USGS maps and in databases at the state and national levels. She will encourage the community to help expand our understanding of place names if they are comfortable doing so. Meetings with the community will be set up for the rest of the year. Hopefully this can contribute to HBGN’s ongoing efforts. This project might be a vehicle to solicit community input on ‘Ohe‘o.

Mr. Mills suggested that the board consider a motion for more research before a decision is made on the name ‘Ohe‘o or “Pools of ‘Ohe‘o”. This could be pending the results of Ms. Louis’s discussions with the East Maui community. Ms. Louis noted that NPS will be included in these discussions because they are part of East Maui Watershed Partnership. Ms. Gates said that they do not need a decision immediately.

Motion: To defer reconsideration of the HBGN’s decision on the name ‘Ohe‘o pending the results of Ms. Louis’s discussions with the East Maui community (Kam/Silva)

Vote: Approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Kam found it interesting that the BGN considers it the objective of state boards to identify names that the community wants. Since she has been on the HBGN, the Board’s focus has been finding original or accurate names and often these are not ones the community knows. This is particularly true when community members are new to an area. Ms. Louis pointed out that many in a community know a name because they learned it from maps. Asking the community about a name is not necessarily a way to confirm the validity of names on maps. Ms. Delos Santos clarified that she was the one that used the term local usage when she asked Ms. Runyon the question. Local usage is not the BGN’s top priority because communities may be using names incorrectly. The question is whether a community is interested in using names in the correct way. Mr. Mills pointed to the example of Barber’s Point becoming Kalaeloa. Everyone now calls the area Kalaeloa. During the transition, many in the community protested the change. Some native Hawaiians wanted it to remain Barbers Point because there was history behind that name and they did not want to lose that history. It marked the event when Captain Henry Barber’s ship ran aground at the point.
Ms. Delos Santos clarified that community preference is one of the BGN’s primary considerations when reviewing a state board recommendation. It will ask for further research if there is a concern instead of rejecting the recommendation. The BGN does not expect high levels of community outreach for all state board decisions. This would only be appropriate if the state board anticipates a decision being controversial. Ms. Louis points out that most HBGN actions have been adding diacritical marks to names and not recommending name changes. This only clarifies meanings of existing names.

Ms. Kam noted that combining components of common place names will not be readily accepted by everyone. Ms. Louis recalled that when the board began following the ‘Ahaui ‘Ōlelo guidelines, it assumed that all applicable names covered by the guidelines should be combined. Names would remain separate if descriptors, such as Kai or Waena, were involved. These are not part of the name and the name remains valid without these descriptors. For Koʻolauloa, loa is part of the name and cannot be removed because it is part of the name. Ms. Kam pointed out that most people in the community do not understand this. They will see a familiar name in a different format and wonder why. It is difficult to expect the community to understand the reasoning used by the Board when making these decisions. Ms. Losch suggested that including communities in this discussion is way to educate them and to explain the reasons for the change. If they understand the intent, they will view place names differently. If they understand that it is honoring the intent of the kupuna, then maybe they will see it that way. She gave the example of Lāʻie. She grew up in Kahuku and everyone said “Lāia”. She questioned why people were saying Lāʻie and was told because they saw it in a book. It is like “mālie” and “mālia”. It is easier to say “mālia” than “mālie”, but the real word is mālie. In everyday speech many people say malia. This happens when a language is not in common use.

Ms. Delos Santos noted that Ms. Runyon specifically said that it was not the BGN’s intent to use circular reasoning. Common usage does not necessarily determine what name should be used going forward. In controversial situations, it is good practice to seek wider input. This would make the work of HBGN more difficult. Ms. Louis believes that more people will understand how the HBGN makes its decisions once the criteria and guidelines used are posted online along with the status of decisions and background on why decisions were made.

Mr. Mills announced that he needed to leave. Ms. Delos Santos volunteered to act as chair for the rest of the meeting.

Mr. Akana suggested that the Board not stop at just ‘Ohe‘o, but consider the name “Ohe-o-Kapo”. He explained that ‘ohe is a kino lau of the goddess Kapo. Ms. Silva pointed out that the Sites of Maui article also names the other pools and the Board should probably consider those as well. It might be good for NPS to include these names in their interpretive materials. Ms. Delos Santos noted that NPS could not use these names until they were recognized by HBGN and entered into the GNIS. Ms. Lane-Kamahele said that NPS still struggles with signage at the pools and finding ways to provide enough information so that people can see the pools without encouraging them to take risks. She also announced that NPS just published a brochure focusing on what the community wants
visitors to know about the park. On the brochure’s map, the area is labeled ‘Ohe’o. A separate tag says “Pools” with an arrow pointing to the pools. In her discussions with Haleakalā National Park staff, they did discuss using this approach if HBGN decided not to reconsider its previous decision. If HBGN takes action on the individual pool names, the park would have the option of including these names in appropriate materials. Ms. Louis pointed that even if HBGN recommends entering the individual pool names in the GNIS, this does not require NPS to use these names in all its publications. Ms. Silva suggested that signage with this kind of information is also important for educating the local population about Hawai‘i place names. She noted that the article in Sites of Maui calls the pools, collectively, “Na Wai Nahiku” and the seventh pool is also named “Nahiku”. Ms. Lane-Kamahele explained that signage identifying all seven pools is problematic because visitors may then want to see all seven which is hazardous. Ms. Silva argued that the Board should consider recognizing these individual names so that NPS would have the option of using them in the future.

Ms. Lane-Kamahele said that she found it interesting that the kupuna and community group working with NPS to develop the brochure did not bring up any of these names for the pools. She did not know if they were aware of the names and choose not to use them or if they did not know them. She is not sure how widely park staff consulted.

AGENDA ITEM 5: Request from Office of Hawaiian Affairs to Reconsider HBGN Decisions on Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa

Mr. Akana presented his reasons for believing that the HBGN decision to combine the names Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa should be reconsidered. He has always seen these name components separated in the literature. This indicates that Kea was the name of the mountain and was not a description of the mountain. Loa was the mountain’s name and not a description. All the Hawaiian language newspaper sources separate the words in these two place names. He believes that the HBGN mistakenly assumed that “Kea” and “Loa” were descriptors of the mountains. It would be like combining Mauna and Ka‘ala on O‘ahu. Ka‘ala is the name of the mountain.

Ms. Silva added that some mele and moʻolelo strongly suggest that the original name for Mauna Kea was Mauna a Wakea. It did not mean “white mountain” originally. This is mentioned in a birth song for Kauikeaouli published in The Echo of Our Song. It is found elsewhere as well so she agrees that the word components should be separate. She noted that she has occasionally seen them combined but this is in later newspapers. She said she agrees with Mr. Akana for the most part. In Theodore Kelsey’s work, he suggests that Mauna Loa was Mauna Háloa. She has not seen this elsewhere.

Ms. Louis said she wished this information had been available when the Board first discussed these names. Ms. Kam agreed that the Board did not have this kind of discussion when the decision was made. She recalls the Board looking at format more than addressing the rationale behind names. Ms. Louis said she appreciates having decisions questioned and people on the board bringing different backgrounds to the discussion. This forces
everyone to examine the intent of place names. Ms. Kam again raised her concern over the many other names that the Board routinely combined in the past.

Mr. Akana asked if the Board should decide now or wait until it has consulted with others. Ms. Louis suggested that the Board consider consulting with community groups that have an interest in these kinds of issues. Ms. Delos Santos reiterated that public outreach is important if a decision is or could be controversial. Ms. Kam thought it might be good to notify people who are following the Board’s previous decisions and let them know that some decisions have changed based on new information. Mr. Akana suggested that we at least inform Mr. Bobby Camara who raised the issue at the last meeting. Ms. Delos Santos pointed out that Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa remain separate in the GNIS even though the HBGN submitted them as combined. The Board could ask that these two changes be removed from the submittal before the changes are entered in the GNIS. Ms. Silva believes that the decision to separate these name components is not controversial because most people are already accustomed to seeing it this way. Ms. Delos Santos confirmed that no one in the community was officially notified of the Board’s previous decision. Mr. Camara only knew because she sent him the spreadsheet when he inquired about other names. Public input is not necessary if no one is clamoring for the change.

**Motion:** To reverse the previous HBGN decision to combine place name components of the place names Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa (Akana/Kam)

**Vote:** Approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Louis said she would change the spreadsheet to reflect this decision and Ms. Delos Santos offered to inform Ms. Runyon and Mr. Camara of the HGBN decision.

Ms. Louis repeated concerns that other place names combined by the Board need to be reexamined and hoped that this process would lead to a broader discussion of the underlying issue. She can easily generate a list of previously combined names for Hawaii Island because most are landforms such as pu‘u and kīpuka. The Board now has the capacity to examine the rationale behind a name more thoroughly, often because information is more readily available online. Ms. Kam said she welcomes the opportunity to revisit these decisions. It can be awkward if the HBGN decision is different from what appears in *Place Names of Hawaii* which many use as a standard reference. Ms. Delos Santos proposed that Hawai‘i Island be given priority because these names have been submitted to the BGN and entry in the GNIS may be pending. There is still an opportunity to change a decision before action is taken by the BGN. Ms. Runyon did say that reconsidering decisions too many times is not good, but the BGN does want names to be as accurate as possible. Clearly explaining why names were reconsidered and changed are an important part of this process.

Ms. Louis suggested that the Board specifically discuss, as an agenda item, how it wants to apply the ‘Ahahui ‘Ōlelo guidelines for combining names before proceedings with the spreadsheets. This discussion could result in a clear statement on why decisions are being reconsidered and how the Board intends to apply the guidelines going forward. Ms. Silva
noted that this exercise would also help the Board compile all the different guidelines or policies developed over the years. It could serve as handbook or users guide for the Board and the public.

Motion: To review HBGN past decisions to combine components of place names and to potentially reconsider those decisions (Silva/Kam)

Vote: Approved unanimously by voice vote.

AGENDA ITEM 6: Continued Discussion of Selected Maui [Hawai‘i] Island Place Names

At the last meeting, Mr. Camara identified several place names on the Hawai‘i Island spreadsheets that he believes should be reconsidered. Included were: Kipukakekake, Pu‘uwa‘awa‘a (quad name correction), Kipukapepeiau, Kamakai‘a Uka, Kamakai‘a Waena, Keahole Southwest, Halema‘uma‘u, Kūki‘o Bay, and Kipuka Mizotas. Ms. McEldowney reported that the specific concerns he raised are listed the November 21, 2013 meeting minutes that will be available shortly. Ms. Louis added the Mr. Camara said he was willing to go through the spreadsheet to see if there were any other place names needing attention. Ms. McEldowney and Ms. Silva both thought some of the questions raised by Mr. Camara needed more discussion while others were relatively simple. A decision on Halema‘uma‘u, in particular, needed deliberation. Ms. Delos Santos proposed considering these names at the next meeting.

Motion: To defer consideration of these Hawai‘i Island place names to a subsequent meeting (McEldowney/Silva)

Vote: Approved unanimously by voice vote.

AGENDA ITEM 7: Discussion of Maui Island Place Names

Motion: To defer discussion of the Maui Island place names to a subsequent meeting (Kam/Silva)

Vote: Approved unanimously by voice vote.

AGENDA ITEM 8: Adjourn

The Board decided to meet next on February 20, 2014 at 10:00 am. The change in time is to accommodate Ms. Silva’s class schedule. The meeting adjourned at 2.20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Holly McEldowney
AGENDA ITEM 1: Call to Order

Mr. Kamanao Mills, Chairperson of the Hawai‘i Board on Geographic Names (HBGN or Board), called the meeting to order at 10:10 am.

The following were in attendance:

MEMBERS: Kalani Akana (Office of Hawaiian Affairs), Joan Delos Santos (Office of Planning), Kamanao Mills (Department of Hawaiian Home Lands), and Noenoe Silva (University of Hawai‘i)

ABSENT: Betty Kam (Bernice P. Bishop Museum), Holly McEldowney (Department of Land and Natural Resources), and Ryan Morales (Land Survey Division)

ADVISORS: Renee Louis, PhD., Naomi Losch (University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa–retired)

OTHERS: Amber Stillman (Office of Mauna Kea Management), Larry Kimura (University of Hawai‘i at Hilo), Fritz Klasner (Office of Mauna Kea Management) by Conference Call

Before proceeding, Mr. Mills asked Board members to introduce themselves for the benefit of those who were joining the meeting by conference call.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Approval of Meeting Minutes of March 20, 2014

A motion to approve the March 20, 2014 meeting minutes was made by Ms. Joan Delos Santos and seconded by Mr. Kalani Akana. The Board approved the motion unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Approval of Meeting Minutes of April 24, 2014

Ms. Delos Santos noted that she made a few minor corrections to the minutes distributed and moved to approve the April 24, 2014 minutes as corrected. The motion was seconded by Mr. Akana. The Board approved the motion unanimously.
AGENDA ITEM 4: Further Discussion of Draft HBGN Style Guide and Past and Future Decision-Making Criteria

Mr. Mills announced that the Board’s ongoing discussion on combining place names would begin with three Board guests, Ms. Amber Stillman, Mr. Larry Kimura, and Mr. Fritz Klasner, who asked to discuss the issue of combining or not combining the name Mauna Kea. He asked them to proceed with their comments.

Mr. Klasner began by explaining their request to address the Board. They have followed the place name information available on the HBGN website for last two years or so and the discussion on Mauna Kea in particular. The Office of Mauna Kea Management (OMK) has a cultural advisory group, the Kahu Kū Mauna Council (Kahu Kū Mauna), of which Mr. Kimura is an emeritus member. The council had reaffirmed the spelling of Mauna Kea as a single name and OMK began the process of transitioning to this spelling. They noticed in the January 2014 HBGN meeting minutes that there was a motion to return to a spelling that separates the name. OMK raised the issue at a subsequent Kahu Kū Mauna meeting and asked members how they wanted to proceed. Mr. Kimura was invited to the meeting to express his thoughts on the matter from the perspective of the local community. Mr. Kimura said that this decision not only affects the name of OMK and all its publications, but it raises a bigger concern over the basis of these kinds of decisions or policy used to make them. The issue is much broader than just Mauna Kea.

Mr. Mills explained that over the last three months the Board has been trying to establish some consistency in the writing of Hawaiian geographic names. It is currently in the process of drafting guidelines for this purpose. The draft guidelines have been prepared and the Board is planning on approving the guidelines at some point after some edits. It is good to have community input on the guidelines and the Board would be happy to send the draft to OMK and to others, particularly Kumu Kimura, for comment. He explained that a founding document of the guidelines is the ‘Ahahui ‘Ōlelo guidelines developed by the 1978 spelling project. The priority step in the Board’s guidelines is to consult with knowledgeable community members and to check written resources as long as those resources do not cite USGS documents. This is to avoid the Board citing its own past decisions as a source. Under the guidelines of the federal Board of Geographic Names, common usage should also be considered. This was the basis of the Board’s decision not to combine the name Mauna Kea.

The common usage policy is that names “that reflect historical spellings or forms commonly used or preferred by the local population should be considered by the Board on Geographic names, as long as those names generally conform to the rules of Hawaiian and/or English.” When information from the community or resources is not available, then the Board uses the ‘Ahahui ‘Ōlelo guidelines to guide decision making. Some of the ‘Ahahui ‘Ōlelo rules are incorporated in the HBGN guidelines. These include having geographic names written as one word; any single word modifier of a geographic name being capitalized with the geographic name, and compound geographic names being written as one word if the initial word is a common noun frequently used to describe geographic features. Instead of reading the guidelines over the phone, Mr. Mills suggested that he send them the draft for their review.
The Board would appreciate their comments and take those comments into account when discussing revisions to the draft.

Mr. Kimura asked that the draft guidelines be sent either to OMK or to him directly. He then gave a brief overview of past efforts made to address spelling concerns when writing the Hawaiian language. All were part of an effort to return the language to the children and families of Hawai‘i. The Hawaiian Lexicon Committee was officially established in 1987 and the Hawaiian Immersion, Kaipuni, was founded in the Department of Education. Before that, the Pūnana Leo program was created in 1983. All of these entities continued the effort that resulted in the ‘Ahahui ‘Ōlelo guidelines. The need for guidelines increased as teaching of the language increased. This was especially true when Hawaiian was offered as a second language in schools, particularly high schools. The language had already been taught at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa since 1921. The Hawaiian language is relatively new in written form, but some ways of writing this language have become accepted as common usage. It is very fortunate that so many Hawaiian language newspapers are now available and that it is so convenient to search them to see how often Mauna Kea is written as a single word. He conducted a search on Mauna Kea and Maunakea beginning with the earliest newspaper, *Ka Lama Hawaii*, and the last, *Ka Hoku o Hawaii*. He counted 399 times that it was spelled as a single word and 66 times it was spelled as two words. This is just using Mauna Kea as an example, but it is a strong indication of what common usage was for our kupuna and native Hawaiian speakers. The missionaries, of course, introduced use of the alphabet and began writing the language based on common sense. He believes common sense still prevails in that we are using the Roman alphabet which includes capital letters and small letters. Common nouns are spelled with small letters and proper nouns, or names, with capital letters. Words are spelled as one word whether they are common nouns or proper nouns. This is basis for all language using the Roman alphabet, including Hawaiian. It would be very valuable to have a policy to assist us in spelling proper nouns such as place names or geographic names. There are other concerns such as adjectives or descriptors attached to a proper noun. Other complications will also occur. In general, a policy to address a proper noun in the Hawaiian language would have a proper name marker, which is ‘o. This is the way our kupuna identified names and from there we have to identify the spelling. Deciding to use capital letters was a good start, but concerns continued to be raised on whether to spell names as one, two, or three words. The tendency is to spell them as one word. His recommendation is that the proper nouns be written as one word and not be separated.

Mr. Mills thanked Mr. Kimura for his comments and staff of OMK for attending the meeting by conference call. He noted that the Board cannot make a decision on the specific issue of Mauna Kea because it is not on this month’s agenda. He asked that OMK submit a written request to the Board asking that it recognize Maunakea as the official spelling. This provides the Board with documentation of the request. Mr. Kimura said he has been working with Ms. Stillman and Mr. Klasner on other place names in the Mauna Kea Science Reserve. There are hundreds of other names to consider as well. They are dealing with policy statements and looking at how to understand proper nouns. For example, there are many pu‘u names. He asked if the Board wanted them to discuss these other names now. Mr. Mills suggested that
they review the draft HBGN guidelines first. He emphasized that the Board seriously debated whether Mauna Kea should be combined or not over a series of meetings. He noted that one rule says that compound names shall be combined when the initial word in the name is a common noun describing geographic features. This includes Pu‘u, Lae, Wai, Pōhaku, and Hale. The guidelines include these types of examples. This is where the Board’s policy is probably consistent with Mr. Kimura’s recommendation. He reiterated that the Board will email them the draft guidelines and welcomes any comments. He encouraged them to include other place names on the mountain when they ask the Board to consider combining Mauna Kea.

Mr. Kimura pointed out that caution is needed when deciding if a feature name, such as pu‘u or lae, is really part of the name or not. It would be great if these decisions could be substantiated by documentation. Because the Hawaiian language newspapers ran for such a long time, they show the progression in what might be called the thinking of native speakers who knew how to use the language. We have to acknowledge this kind of usage which was handed down by generations. We cannot turn our eyes away from this thinking. We need to see how they used the word pu‘u as a name or not as a name. We must rely on this documentation to substantiate policies. He also noted that oral recordings can be used. These are critical in determining pronunciation and use of glottal stops and macrons. He used the example of Pu‘uohoku above Hālawa Valley on Moloka‘i. Native speakers used this name as one word. Another example is “Kapu‘u o something or somebody”. Kapu‘u is used as a common noun rather than a proper noun because it is proceeded by a ka‘i or article. He has seen this name written in different ways which shows that people were already dealing with the problem of how to spell names. They knew, however, that it was a name because this was indicated by use of the language. Because we know the pronunciation, we know that it is Hoku and not Hōkū. The hard part was hearing whether there was an ‘okina before the “o” in Pu‘uohoku. It can be hard to detect ‘okina. As he hears them, people of Moloka‘i say “Moloka‘i”. He agreed to review the draft guidelines to see how they apply to place names within the Mauna Kea Science Reserve.

Mr. Mills reiterated that the draft guidelines would be emailed to OMK and emphasized that Mr. Kimura’s voice has weight with those in the Hawaiian community. Mr. Klasner asked that the guidelines be sent directly to Kahu Kū Mauna as this discussion originated with the council. It will review the guidelines and the comments will come from the council, not from OMK itself. This will increase the time needed to respond. Mr. Mills stressed that it is a draft document and is still open to comment. The Board has not adopted the guidelines yet although it plans to do so during one of the upcoming meetings. The conference call ended.

Ms. Silva pointed out that this discussion demonstrates just how difficult these decisions can be and how different perspectives approach the question differently. Mr. Akana expressed his appreciation for the data Mr. Kimura provided on the spelling of Mauna Kea in Hawaiian language newspapers. Ms. Naomi Losch clarified that names are “proper nouns” and not “proper names”. A proper noun is a name.
Discussion then began on the second draft of the Board’s guidelines. Mr. Mills called attention to changes he made since the last meeting. First, he switched the order of “Check Resources” and “Consult with Knowledgeable Community Members”. Consulting with knowledgeable community members is listed first. Under “Check Resources”, he removed the short list of resources and instead noted that recommended references are listed in the attachment. The rule not to cite the USGS was placed in the second paragraph. Under “Consider Common Usage”, he removed the end of the paragraph which read “…and are not obscene or derogatory.” Mr. Akana suggested that “Board on Geographic Names” be changed to “Hawai‘i Board on Geographic Names” in the rule discussing common usage.

For the “Naming Guidelines”, Mr. Mills noted that he added “Luna” and “Lalo” as examples under “c” as well as “Loko” and “Waho”. The third page will be the list of standard references used by the Board. He thanked Ms. Silva for preparing the draft of this list. Ms. Silva asked if members had any suggestions on references that should be added or removed from the list. Ms. Louis recalled that we discussed adding Mr. Fredrick Wichman’s book on Kaua‘i place names. Ms. Silva said she would add it. Mr. Mills noted that nupepa.org was left off the list. Ms. Silva agreed its omission was an oversight. Mr. Mills asked Ms. Louis if she was comfortable adding the “Hawaiian Place Names” database compiled by Mr. Lloyd Soehren. Ms. Louis said yes although she has some concerns. She is concerned that names do not have diacritical marks and it does not include descriptions of the places which can help users understand the meaning of a place name. It is a good reference in that it cites the source of each name in the database, many of which are from old land documents. Also it includes many more names than are available on any map and it would be a good starting point when the HBGN is ready to populate its database with names not found on topographic maps or in the Geographic Names Information System (GNIS). The Soehren database uses State Plane coordinates to indicate the locations of names. This coordinate system is not used any more so the locations would need to be rectified. Ms. Silva said that a note should be added explaining these cautions. She really appreciates the database because it includes so many place names not found in other sources and it at least provides the general location of a name. She has found it to be very useful when she finds a place while reading something but has no idea of its location. The database includes some information transcribed from the Boundary Commission documents which could contribute to Board deliberations. A note could suggest that the database be used for research only.

Mr. Akana asked to discuss the guideline rule which addresses names such as Kalihi Uka and Kalihi Kai. Based on available information, he believes the rule should be changed to recommend combining these kinds of names. It should be like combining Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa. The modifier “Uka” modifies “Kalihi”. In Hawaiian language newspapers the words are combined into a single name and he believes the rule should conform to what appears in the Hawaiian language newspapers. He could not find examples of place names with “One” or “Two” in the newspapers, but other modifiers were combined with geographic names. Ms. Silva suggested that more research be done on this rule. Mr. Akana clarified that this was what he observed although he did not tally his findings. He supports Mr. Kimura’s perspective that priority be given to usage and spelling as expressed in the Hawaiian language newspapers. The newspapers were published over a long period of time and represent how
native speakers grappled with how names should be spelled. He believes we should follow their decisions. Ms. Losch pointed out that much of this has to do with listening to how the language is spoken. If you hear Kalihi Uka, it sounds like one word but it is describing upper Kalihi. If you were to write it as you heard it, you are going to write it as one word. There is no separation when people speak these names. They heard it as one word and wrote it as such. Is this a problem? Mr. Mills reiterated that this rule is from the ʻAhahui ʻŌlelo guidelines. These names were separated because they saw the place name as being “Kalihi” and “Uka” only clarified that the speaker was referring to the higher part of Kalihi. Mr. Akana relayed some of his findings from the newspapers. He found Kalihikai and Kalihiuka written as one name along with many other examples. This was as early as 1834. If the Board accepts this rule, then Koʻolaupoko and Koʻolauloa are not exceptions. Ms. Losch noted that, in 1978, those developing the guidelines did not have access to these kinds of resources to check past usage. Mr. Akana pointed out that Mr. Kimura alluded to this point when he described efforts to clarify spelling usage as a process that has progressed through the work of various committees and groups over the years and they are still grappling with how to spell this written language.

Ms. Louis asked if anyone could think of examples that justify keeping rule “c” in the guidelines. Mr. Mills thought that names such as Kealia 1 and Kealia 2 are examples of names that should not be combined. This is not a Hawaiian language issue. He suggested that the Board continue to look for any other examples. Mr. Akana noted that the Board may still want to consider keeping names separate when it is common usage to do so. This would include schools in Kalihi. Ms. Delos Santos reiterated that the law requires state agency to use names determined by the HBGN. If the HBGN decides to combine a name, then all agency signs and documents should combine the name. Mr. Mills said that when he sends the guidelines to Mr. Kimura, he will let him know that the Board is considering removing the “unless a single word modifier at the end separates an already established place name into two or more geographic regions.” Rule “c” would then read: “Geographic names shall be written as one word.” Ms. Louis noted that “c” and “d” are different in that “c” was meant to address words that refer to an area within a place name whereas “d” deals with words that describe a geographic feature type. Mr. Mills then questioned whether or not “d” was needed at all if “c” is removed. Ms. Silva believed that it would be helpful to keep “d” because it is a way to affirm the Board’s decision that these should be one word. The rule should be left in with examples.

Mr. Mills asked if there are any examples in which it is appropriate to separate a place name. Mr. Akana noted that the guidelines do not currently address separating a place name that includes a proper noun. Kīpuka Mizota is an example as is Kīpuka Kapāʻū. Ms. Louis recalled that someone at Hawaii Volcanos National Park wanted to keep place names with kīpuka separate because it would be easier for people to understand that the name applies to a particular feature type. The Board at that time did not agree and believed all these types of names should be combined. Mr. Akana noted that it is clear that Ms. Mary Kawena Pukui also grappled with this issue. Ms. Losch pointed out that Place Names of Hawaii has Maunakea the street written as one word while the mountain is written as Mauna Kea. Mr. Akana said he
still believes that Hale o Lono and Hale o Keawe should be separated because each includes a
proper noun. Ms. Losch pointed out that “Hale” is not a geographic feature. Ms. Louis
suggested that having a rule for separating names with proper nouns would give the Board the
opportunity to discuss situations such as Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa more easily. She
recommended that an “unless” clause be included in “d” which specifies that names with
proper nouns should be separated. This could also be addressed in a separate rule.

Mr. Mills asked if he should include the phrase “when a place is named after someone.” He
could then add the example Kīpuka Kapāʻū. He can also add a statement like “when evidence
suggests” that the place name includes a proper noun. He is trying to draw a line between
names such as Haleolono when it is combined and Kīpuka Kapāʻū where it is separated
because the place was named after someone. He wants to emphasize the need for evidence
because without any evidence, the Board will not know if it is a person’s name or not. This
accommodates situations in which someone comes before the board and says a place was
named after my grandfather. Ms. Louis pointed to the example of Palikapuokeʻua at
Kealakekua. It is a combined name that includes the name of the person named Keōua. Mr.
Akana also suggested that the Board do more research on names that include an “o” as in
Puʻuohoku.

Mr. Mills encouraged Board members to email him with suggestions or thoughts. He will
continue to compile and revise until the Board is comfortable with the guidelines.

Ms. Louis suggested that the guidelines include an explicit statement acknowledging that the
guidelines are not the final word on this issue and that it will evolve over time as more
information and perspectives become available.

AGENDA ITEM 5: Discussion of Maui Island Place Names (Continued review of
Maui Island place names for spelling and diacritical marks)

Mr. Mills announced that he needed to leave and the Board would therefore lose quorum.
Agenda Item 5 was deferred to a future meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 6: Adjourn

Mr. Mills moved to adjourn the meeting, Ms. Silva seconded the motion, and the Board
approved the motion unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:15 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

Holly McEldowney