

1. CCH writes “The two housing areas were evaluated as separate historic districts. Both were determined to be eligible for listing in the NRHP. As a consulting party, the US Navy was provided with the Historic Resources Technical Report in Aug 2008. The Navy’s comments on this report did not reflect any concern with the evaluation of the Makalapa Navy Housing and Little Makalapa Navy Housing areas as separate resources.”

HRTR page 4-37 makes casual mention of Little Makalapa and the historic Makalapa Naval Housing area. Please clarify what are you trying to accomplish here?

2. “At a July 2009 meeting with the US Navy staff to discuss comments and questions about the Project’s effects to historic resources, the US Navy provided a copy of a map that was identified as being from its draft ICRMP that had yet to be approved.”

The map in the draft ICRMP that was provided to CCH at the July 2009 meeting was an approved map as it is the same map in the 2002 ICRMP. There were no changes.

3. Request consistency in CCH’s letter regarding whether there are adverse effects or no adverse effects.