From: Harvey Berliner
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
Sent: 5/6/2009 3:09:21 PM
Subject: RE: Peral Harbor Station

Commander:

We feel that the best alternative is Option 1b. We are moving the station location slightly Ewa to meet the minimum stand-off distance to the Synagogue/Clinic building for the emergency exit. This would not require the relocation of any of the buildings.

We are working on a revised site plan for Option 1b and should be able to send it to you this week for your review.

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