

---

**From:** Miyamoto, Faith  
**To:** 'Muraoka, John T CIV NAVREGHAWAII N45'  
**CC:** 'Hogan, Steven'; Foell, Stephanie; 'Judy Aranda'; Souki, Jesse K.; Hamayasu, Toru; Caldwell, Kirk  
**Sent:** 1/21/2010 1:16:54 PM  
**Subject:** FW: Navy Response Letter to City re: Makalapa

Hi John –

We reviewed the draft response letter and have the following comments:

1. The letter responds to the City's letter to you providing information regarding the rationale for the setting the boundaries for the Makalapa Housing and Little Makalapa Housing. The Navy response is a little weak in that it merely states that it does not disagree with the approach taken by the City. Are you pursuing this with the SHPO? More important than responding to the City, the Navy should be actively working to convince the SHPO that the boundaries identified by the City are appropriate for the Section 106 process and those boundaries are what should be shown in the SHPD files. SHPD has indicated that the ICRMP boundaries are the only ones on file at the SHPD office and that the boundaries of the historic resource should be determined by the landowner. Therefore, the Navy needs to work with SHPD to show two historic resources, Makalapa and Little Makalapa. If this letter is the being used to convey the Navy's position, then it should state this clearly.
2. The current Navy comments on the Section 106 PA that were sent to the signatories state that the Makalapa Naval Housing should include Little Makalapa Housing. The Navy needs to revise those comments to be consistent with the response to the City. Again, if this letter is being used to rescind those comments, this should be clearly stated. Because those comments were sent directly to the FTA, SHPD, and ACHP, the Navy should clearly direct any revision in position to those three parties.
3. I do take exception to the last sentence in the third paragraph that states that "it is unfortunate that this approach was not highlighted to all stakeholders earlier in the process". All consulting parties receive a copy of the historic properties report in August 2008, in which the City's approach of delineating the two districts was established. The two districts were also included in the Historic Effects Report distributed to all consulting parties in April 2009. The Navy elected not to comment on the individual treatment of the two districts at either time.

Call me if you have any questions.

Faith Miyamoto  
Department of Transportation Services  
City & County of Honolulu  
(808) 768-8350  
fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov

---

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

AR00117030