

HONOLULU HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

Formatted: Right: 0"

Comment Resolution Meeting with FTA

On Review Draft FEIS (4/29/2010) and Comment Responses Letters

MEETING NOTES

Date: Monday, May 24, 2010

Time: 8:00 a.m. HST

Location: Ali'i Place – Small Conference Room

Attendees: Toru Hamayasu, Jim Van Epps, Faith Miyamoto, Judy Aranda, Steve Hogan, Amy Zaref, Kristin Carlson, Carrie Oshiro

Attended by phone: Jesse Souki, Lawrence Spurgeon, Liz Zelasko (FTA), Ted Matley (FTA), Joe Assi (FTA), Katie Grassi (FTA), Jill ??? (FTA), Renee ??? (FTA).

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and receive clarification on the FTA's comments on the 4-28-10 Review Draft FEIS and comment letters.

1. Section 4(f) Text

- RTD sent documentation to FTA regarding the DAV Memorial.
- FTA questions: Does it function as a park and is it publically owned?
- Amy Zaref's response: It is owned by the State Division of Parks but conveyed for a memorial. People can use the land like a park, but it has multiple uses. Primary use is as a memorial but a portion of the property functions as a park. This memorial was not set up to be a park. The only effect would be four columns placed on the property near the road.
- FTA comment: It may be protected by 4(f), but there may be no use. Needs further discussion. FTA generally treats memorials like parks. Chris made the FTA's comments on this section and was not able to attend this meeting/call. Discussion on 4(f) and Chapter 5 deferred until tomorrow (5/25) for another call that includes Chris.

2. Questions about comments

- References to the AIS
 - FTA (Liz Zelasko) would like to see the status of the AIS included. Faith Miyamoto noted that the SHPD accepted (approved) the report.
- Resolution of Phase 4 Archeological Surveys
 - FTA: The PA says the Phase 4 archeological surveys will be deferred until we have more developed plans. When will this be done?
 - Steve Hogan's response: We agreed to speed up the AIS for Phase 4 and begin that work this year (if feasible). This is substantially earlier than what has been done in most cases.
 - FTA: Describe in the document what we're doing and that it's early.
 - Amy Zaref's Response: Will include reference to document that includes more detail.
- Construction Noise Plan (4-205 Noise Protocol)
 - Permits are per construction contract. The language in the document is what Jim Barr requested be used.
 - The comments on this section may have come from Ray, who was not on the call. Ted Matley will follow up with him.

3. Letters

- References to sections/tables
 - Steve Hogan explained that if there is a reference to a section/table in the response letter, we prefer not to duplicate the section/table in the response. The reference would be provided as back-up to the response, not a duplication of efforts.
 - FTA: Some summary information needs to be provided. The response should include a summary of what our position is, not just a reference to a section of the EIS.
 - The FTA generally agreed with the approach of summarizing the information referenced, however, they are concerned that some letters don't follow the approach.
 - Liz Zelasko summarized the two issues relevant to some of the letters:
 1. Letters didn't reference back to the EIS often enough
 2. Explanation was not provided; summary needed
 - Steve Hogan noted that more detail has been added to some letters. In some cases we didn't understand the comment or thought that we addressed the issue already. We will have responses to comments (including the revised versions of the letters) to send to FTA for review. These may be sent to FTA in two batches. Lawrence Spurgeon added that there were differing comments from different reviewers on similar text. He tried to capture the revisions consistently.
 - FTA indicated that they would like to see the revised letters.
- Requests for information not in EIS
 - Steve Hogan asked how to handle requests for information in the letters when that information is not in the EIS.
 - FTA believes that if it is related to this project, we need to respond, but specific examples would help them better understand this concern.
 - Steve will follow up via email.
- FTA Guidance on Modeling
 - Kristin Carlson had concerns about specific references to "FTA guidance on modeling" since this guidance was from consultation rather than a specific document.
 - FTA: Use "consultation with FTA" instead of guidance language so it doesn't sound like we're referring to a document.
- Review of Revised Letters
 - Steve Hogan: As we complete the letters, we would like the original reviewers to look at the responses.
 - Liz Zelasko will distribute as appropriate. Some staff are out of the office this week.
- Chapter 8 and Appendix I
 - Joe Assi?? noted that all mitigation commitments in the letters should be captured in Appendix I.
 - Renee ??? added that Chapter 8 should be updated if appropriate base on the changes to the letters.
 - Steve Hogan: We will be sending an updated Appendix I with tracked changes, plus a clean version.

Adjourned: 8:50 a.m.

Meeting notes prepared by Carrie Oshiro, PB (oshiro@pbworld.com)