From: Aguayo, Lore CDR NAVFAC HI, PRP
To: Harvey Berliner; Tanaka, Lynn K. T., NAVFAC Hawaii, AM
CC: Dunn, James; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Miyamoto, Faith; Simon Zweighaft; Laura Ray
Sent: 5/13/2009 3:04:20 PM
Subject: RE: Peral Harbor Station - Revised Option 1B

Harvey,

Thank you for the response. Just want to clarify a couple points:

1) Navy/Transit would need to agree to the monetary value of demolishing barracks and building new (or restore), if required by the location of the station, and Transit would reimburse monetarily for the work. Navy would need to execute the work. We are checking with our Counsel to see if there is a mechanism in place to have this type of arrangment. Typically it requires special legislation for the Navy to accept cash for in-kind services.

2) You state at the end of your e-mail that Option 2B is the best concept plan at this time from Transit's perspective. Did you mean 2B or 1B?

Thank you-

v/r,

Lore Aguayo
CDR, CEC, USN
Public Works Officer
NAVSTA Pearl Harbor
NAVFAC Hawaii
(808)471-2647
cell (808)349-9704
maria.aguayo@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----
From: Harvey Berliner [mailto:Berliner@infraconsultllc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2009 13:17
To: Aguayo, Lore CDR NAVFAC HI, PRP; Tanaka, Lynn K. T., NAVFAC Hawaii, AM
Cc: Dunn, James; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Miyamoto, Faith; Simon Zweighaft; Laura Ray
Subject: RE: Peral Harbor Station - Revised Option 1B

Commander:

If we proceed with Option 2B there are several issues which I will outline below:

* Transit would be responsible for the cost associated with rearrangement of any impacted Navy housing facilities. However, it is not transit's policy to build any new housing. An equitable monetary agreement would have to be reached and this money turned over to the Navy.

* We would have to develop an agreeable plan for the station and determine its effect on the barrack's building. We would then need to hire a consultant to investigate the existing building to determine if the barracks can be practically demolished and restored or completely demolished and the entire facility replaced. This would need to be discussed and worked out between the Navy and Transit including who would be doing the demolition of the facility. .

* In either case a firm would need to be retained to determine the cost of either the restoration of the existing facility and the building of a new partial facility or the building of a completely new facility on the base. This would become the cost basis for the agreement between the Navy and Transit. An agreement would need to be reached between the Navy and Transit for the replacement cost.

* The transit project would be responsible for the costs associated with the demolition of the existing facility, restoration of the existing barracks, if required and the building of new barracks. Again, who does the demolition and restoration would need to be part of the

agreement, however, the Navy using the money settlement from Transit, would be responsible for construction of the new barracks.

Keeping the above in mind, the Option 2B which we previously submitted is probably the best concept plan at this time. If this Option is selected by the Navy, we will need to start working on a more detailed site plan for the station and its effect on the existing barracks building using the minimum stand-off requirements.

The above sounds complicated. If the Navy is interested in proceeding with Option 2B, I suggest we meet again to discuss these issues.

Let me know your thoughts.

Harvey L. Berliner, PE

berliner@infraconsultllc.com

hberliner@honolulu.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Aguayo, Lore CDR NAVFAC HI, PRP [mailto:Maria.Aguayo@navy.mil]
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2009 12:25 PM
To: Harvey Berliner; Tanaka, Lynn K. T., NAVFAC Hawaii, AM
Cc: Dunn, James; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Miyamoto, Faith; Simon Zweighaft; Laura Ray
Subject: RE: Peral Harbor Station - Revised Option 1B

Harvey,

Thank you for the revised drawings. As we evaluate our options, we still have the question as to what the Rail project will relocate if we go with option 2B. We still want to consider this option as well.

v/r,

Lore Aguayo

CDR, CEC, USN

Public Works Officer

NAVSTA Pearl Harbor

NAVFAC Hawaii

(808)471-2647

cell (808)349-9704

maria.aguayo@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: Harvey Berliner [mailto:Berliner@infraconsultllc.com]

Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2009 12:34

To: Aguayo, Lore CDR NAVFAC HI, PRP; Tanaka, Lynn K. T., NAVFAC Hawaii, AM

Cc: Dunn, James; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Miyamoto, Faith; Simon Zweighaft; Laura Ray

Subject: Peral Harbor Station - Revised Option 1B

Commander:

Attached is revised Option 1B. This provides the minimum stand-off distance between the closest point of the transit structure (emergency exit) and the existing Chapel / Clinic building on the Makai side of Kamehameha Hwy. We feel that this is the best Option for the station and provides the least distribution to Navy facilities. It also moves the station structure further away from the Makalapa Gate Entry Control Point. However, the appropriate screening will still be included to preclude view (line of sight) of Makalapa gate area.

The footprint of station entrance on the Mauka side of Kamehameha Hwy is still very preliminary. We will need to work with you and your staff when more details for the station entrance are developed.

We look forward to the Navy's approval of this Option so we can proceed in the completion of the FEIS documents and preliminary design effort.

Harvey L. Berliner, PE

berliner@infraconsultllc.com

hberliner@honolulu.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Aguayo, Lore CDR NAVFAC HI, PRP [mailto:Maria.Aguayo@navy.mil]

Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2009 3:00 PM

To: Harvey Berliner; Tanaka, Lynn K. T., NAVFAC Hawaii, AM

Cc: Dunn, James; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Miyamoto, Faith; Simon Zweighaft; Laura Ray

Subject: RE: Peral Harbor Station

Harvey,

As stated below, the stand-off distance from the fence for a gathering fence is 82 feet. We need better understanding on whether each of your options will require relocation of facilities impacted by the stand-off and whether it will be funded by rail. Need to know specifically if you would relocate part or all of the facility.

Understand that we would provide the land property for relocation.

Again, once we fully understand this, we can provide the preferred option. Thank you.

v/r,

Lore Aguayo

CDR, CEC, USN

Public Works Officer

NAVSTA Pearl Harbor

NAVFAC Hawaii

(808)471-2647

cell (808)349-9704

maria.aguayo@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: Harvey Berliner [mailto:Berliner@infraconsultllc.com]

Sent: Friday, May 01, 2009 9:25

To: Aguayo, Lore CDR NAVFAC HI, PRP; Tanaka, Lynn K. T., NAVFAC Hawaii, AM

Cc: 'Dunn, James'; 'Spurgeon, Lawrence'; 'Miyamoto, Faith'; Simon Zweighaft; Laura Ray

Subject: RE: Peral Harbor Station

Commander:

Will we be getting a decision on the location of the Pearl Harbor Station today?

The rail project will be responsible for the costs which are directly related to the rail construction. Therefore the cost of demolition, renovation, relocation of fencing, etc. required on Navy property due to the rail construction would be borne by the rail project.

Harvey L. Berliner, PE

berliner@infraconsultllc.com

hberliner@honolulu.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Harvey Berliner

Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2009 7:31 AM

To: Aguayo, Lore CDR NAVFAC HI, PRP; Tanaka, Lynn K. T., NAVFAC Hawaii, AM

Cc: Dunn, James; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Miyamoto, Faith; Gary Takahashi; Simon Zweighaft; Laura Ray; Loverso, Peter; 'Toru Hamayasu (thamayasu@honolulu.gov)'

Subject: RE: Peral Harbor Station

CDR:

Thank you for your email.

All security issues will be addressed and mitigated. A Threat and Vulnerability Assessment (TVA) Report is being prepared specific to the Navy base. The Pearl Harbor TVA will be shared for review to the appropriate Navy personnel when it is ready for external review.

As far as the costs issues, I will research this answer and get back to you. I believe that the rail project will be responsible for the costs which are directly related to the rail construction, but I need to verify that this is correct before a definite statement can be made.

I look forward to the Navy decision of the location of the Pearl Harbor Station by the end of this week.

Harvey L. Berliner, PE

berliner@infraconsultllc.com

hberliner@honolulu.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Aguayo, Lore CDR NAVFAC HI, PRP [mailto:Maria.Aguayo@navy.mil]

Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2009 6:55 PM

To: Harvey Berliner; Tanaka, Lynn K. T., NAVFAC Hawaii, AM

Cc: Dunn, James; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Miyamoto, Faith; Gary Takahashi

Subject: RE: Peral Harbor Station

Harvey,

I briefed CAPT Kitchens and he also met with his security team and came up with the following ATFP concerns:

1. Concurrence on Comparative Matrix completed by Harvey Berlinger with inputs from Navy Region team.

2. Hostile surveillance activities could be conducted while on platform.

3. The need for a screening device shall be included to preclude view (line of sight) of Makalapa gate.

4. Security monitor equipment shall be utilized by State of Hawaii or City of HNL police officials.

5. The expectation of Navy Property for the emergency ramp and station is to build an enclave to prevent access.

6. Per the Unified Facility Criteria (DOD standard for base facilities) 4-010-01, it states that the minimum standoff distance to structures used as a gathering place (i.e. the Jewish Synagogue) is 82feet or 25 meters from the fence line of the Base perimeter. This would preclude/limit the construction of some platforms.

7. The Aloha stadium "park and ride" proposal, due to the height aspect of the railway station, would have view of the Ford Island gate checkpoint and would also need a screen to shield from view.

The question is whether these concerns will be addressed and mitigated if a station were to be located by Makalapa Gate.

Also, the question came up if there is an expectation on any of the options that the Navy fund any of the requirements? (i.e. demolition, relocation of

fence.....) We would need to understand what costs are expected to be incurred, if any, by the Navy.

With regards to Option 2A which requires partial demolition of the Barracks, who would fund the demolition? Is the idea to demolish part of the Barracks without replacing that lost footprint? In other words, we would loose a certain amount of Barracks space?

I know you need a response by end of the month, and will push for a decision once I can get some answers to these questions. Thank you.

v/r,

Lore Aguayo

CDR, CEC, USN

Public Works Officer

NAVSTA Pearl Harbor

NAVFAC Hawaii

(808)471-2647

cell (808)349-9704

maria.aguayo@navy.mil

-----Original Message-----

From: Harvey Berliner [mailto:Berliner@infraconsultllc.com]

Sent: Monday, April 13, 2009 8:14

To: Tanaka, Lynn K. T., NAVFAC Hawaii, AM

Cc: Aguayo, Lore CDR NAVFAC HI, PRP; Dunn, James; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Miyamoto, Faith; Gary Takahashi

Subject: Peral Harbor Station

Lynn:

Attached is the comparative matrix we will use for our discussion at Friday's meeting. It states the facts for the four options; two at Radford Drive, Center Street and the no-build option. I believe that this is the analysis that CDR Aquayo was requesting. Since we are in the final stages of the FEIS process, we will need a decision from the Navy quickly on the station location, especially if it is other than one of the two Radford Drive locations.

Please pass this matrix around so those attending can review prior to the meeting.

We plan on bringing exhibits with us to show the three station locations.

See you on Friday.

PS: I still have not received the paper work to enter the base from Lori Ing.

Harvey L. Berliner, PE

City and County of Honolulu

DTS - Rapid Transit Division

Chief Facilities Engineer

808-768-6123 (o)

808-291-5146 (c)

berliner@infraconsultllc.com

hberliner@honolulu.gov