From: Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
To: Ryan, James <FTA>
Sent: 2/21/2007 12:06:35 PM
Subject: FW: Honolulu Draft NOI

From: Spurgeon, Lawrence [mailto:Spurgeon@pbworld.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2007 9:37 PM
To: Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
Cc: Scheibe, Mark; Turchie, Donna <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; fmiyamoto@co.honolulu.hi.us
Subject: RE: Honolulu Draft NOI

Right, I get your point. Certainly not our intent at all. I am adding back in your language and listing the specific technologies still under consideration at this time.
-----Original Message-----
From: Joseph.Ossi@dot.gov [mailto:Joseph.Ossi@dot.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2007 12:53 PM
To: Spurgeon, Lawrence
Cc: Scheibe, Mark; Donna.Turchie@dot.gov; Raymond.Sukys@dot.gov; fmiyamoto@co.honolulu.hi.us
Subject: RE: Honolulu Draft NOI

Your second change is not acceptable. The NOI cannot be ambiguous about the technology or technologies being considered AT THIS TIME. No one can comment meaningfully on the impacts if we haven't said what is being proposed. The technologies differ considerably in impact and withholding that important piece of information is contrary to open government and, if TPE has anything to say on the matter, FTA will not participate in such subterfuge.

From: Spurgeon, Lawrence [mailto:Spurgeon@pbworld.com]
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2007 7:51 PM
To: Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
Cc: Scheibe, Mark; Turchie, Donna <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Faith Miyamoto (Honolulu DTS
Subject: RE: Honolulu Draft NOI

Joe,
Good points. I like the flexibility created by carrying two build alternatives. I have incorporated all of them with two changes (and a few fill-ins and minor wording changes):

1) I re-wrote the first paragraph under Background to be factually correct in the order of events related to the original NOI.

2) I eliminated reference to transit technology. We completely acknowledge the need to establish the technology prior to the Final EIS, and are only trying to work out if we will be carrying several technologies into the draft EIS, or refine based on technical merits prior to the draft.

I wanted to give you an opportunity to look this back over and see if you had any outstanding concerns before we make an official submittal.

Thanks a lot, I appreciate your advice,
Lawrence
-----Original Message-----
From: Joseph.Ossi@dot.gov [mailto:Joseph.Ossi@dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2007 9:27 AM
To: Spurgeon, Lawrence

Cc: Scheibe, Mark; Donna.Turchie@dot.gov; Raymond.Sukys@dot.gov
Subject: RE: Honolulu Draft NOI

Attached are my comments on the draft NOI, for your consideration.

Joe Ossi
FTA Office of Planning and Environment
(202) 366-1613

From: Spurgeon, Lawrence [mailto:Spurgeon@pbworld.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2007 3:12 PM
To: Ossi, Joseph <FTA>; Turchie, Donna <FTA>
Cc: Faith Miyamoto (Honolulu DTS; Scheibe, Mark
Subject: Honolulu Draft NOI

Joe,

Thank you for meeting with me last week. I appreciated getting to know who you are and your ideas on this project.

Here is the draft Notice of Intent that you discussed with Toru and Mark this morning. I have put preliminary dates in the NOI that would correspond to an issuance around February 28/March 1 to provide a 30 day comment period. Dates may be adjusted of course. Please let me know if there is anything else that I can do.

Lawrence Spurgeon
PB
(808) 566-2226 office
(808) 223-3459 mobile
1001 Bishop Street, Suite 2400
Honolulu, HI 96813

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.