
From: Spurgeon, Lawrence
To: 'Pua.Aiu@hawaii.gov'; 'Nancy.A.McMahon@hawaii.gov'; 'Ted.Matley@dot.gov'; 'Miyamoto, Faith'
CC: 'Aranda@infraconsultllc.com'; 'Ross.W.Stephenson@hawaii.gov'; Hogan, Steven; Foell, Stephanie; Assum-Dahleen, Laura
Sent: 1/5/2010 2:24:36 PM
Subject: RE: Makalapa Housing

Pua,

In response to your other question, we have confirmed that Radford Drive was constructed mauka of Kamehameha Highway between 1974 and 1976, eliminating Midway Drive as the access to Little Makalapa.

From: Spurgeon, Lawrence
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 2:07 PM
To: Pua.Aiu@hawaii.gov; Nancy.A.McMahon@hawaii.gov; Ted.Matley@dot.gov; Miyamoto, Faith
Cc: Aranda@infraconsultllc.com; Ross.W.Stephenson@hawaii.gov; Hogan, Steven; Foell, Stephanie; Assum-Dahleen, Laura; Nagao, Bruce
Subject: FW: Makalapa Housing

Aloha Pua,

Per Faith's request, the e-mail below provides the architect's explanation of the different boundaries for different purposes at Makalapa. It should provide the requested record. This is in response to the e-mail that Faith forwarded to me as clipped here:

From: Pua.Aiu@hawaii.gov [mailto:Pua.Aiu@hawaii.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 9:37 AM
To: Miyamoto, Faith
Subject: RE: FW: Makalapa Eligibility Forms

How does Mason reconcile that the 2008 ICRMP still treats the two Makalapa's a housing zone? And are they willing to go on record to support the separation of the zone?

pua

Also, We are working on when Radford Drive was constructed to access the base. From a 1951 Aerial photo from USGS, the roadway existed at Kamehameha Highway, but was configured differently, splitting into separate roadways into Makalapa and Little Makalapa areas and not continuing through mauka on the current Radford Drive alignment. It appears that the original entrances must have been eliminated when Radford Drive was continued through (possibly around the time of H-1's construction). I have included the 1951 aerial on the attached FTP link.

<https://ftp.pbworld.com/GetFile.aspx?fn=1243787412.zip>

From: Dee Ruzicka [mailto:dr@masonarch.com]
Sent: Monday, December 28, 2009 11:43 AM
To: Spurgeon, Lawrence
Cc: Glenn Mason
Subject: RE: Makalapa Housing

Hi Lawrence,

The reason for the difference is due entirely to the difference in purpose of the two studies that were done. The 2002 ICRMP was, as the title indicates, an Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plan. The two housing areas were grouped together because they are relatively contiguous and shared a common function at the time of the 2002 ICRMP. The ICRMP also calls them "two distinct sub-areas . . . Spatially and physically separated by natural topography and vehicular circulation" (page 3-219). Although the two housing areas were built about the same time, the housing types are different and they originally housed different populations, with Little Makalapa housing civilians and the Makalapa proper housing Naval officers' families. MAI identified Makalapa and Little Makalapa as two separate areas because the two areas are currently distinct.

In other words MAI did not change its approach to the areas in question between 2002 and 2007. The ICRMP was designed to guide the Navy's management decisions concerning historic resources. The ICRMP identified other management zones. For example, all of Ford Island was identified as one management zone in the ICRMP, but it includes a very wide variety of resources.

Our study for the transit project was simply to help identify historic resources; it dealt with a specific plan for a specific project that contained the potential for various impacts. For the same reasons we identified in the 2002 ICRMP, we felt that for the transit study that Makalapa and Little Makalapa should be identified as distinct resources when considering the project's impacts. There is no inconsistency here – the purpose of the two studies was entirely different.

Thanks,
Dee

From: Spurgeon, Lawrence [mailto:Spurgeon@pbworld.com]
Sent: Monday, December 28, 2009 9:30 AM
To: Dee Ruzicka; Ann Yoklavich (Mason Architects)
Cc: Foell, Stephanie; Hogan, Steven
Subject: Makalapa Housing

Aloha Dee and Ann

(I think I heard that Ann is back from sabbatical, if wrong, I apologize).

We are trying to conclude the Section 106 PA process with the SHPD, but they have recently asked us to consider starting-over with the Makalapa housing areas. I am trying to get some background. The SHPD told us that Mason Architecture identified Makalapa and Little Makalapa as a single area for the Navy in 2002 ICRMP analysis, and are now asking why it was identified as two separate areas in our Section 106 documentation. Can you explain Mason's reasoning for changing approach between 2002 and 2007?

Thanks,
Lawrence

Lawrence Spurgeon
Parsons Brinckerhoff
(808)768-6147
spurgeon@pbworld.com

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.