From: Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
To: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>
CC: HynesCherin, Brigid <FTA>; Bausch, Carl <FTA>; Libberton, Sean <FTA>; Van Wyk, Christopher <FTA>
Sent: 4/26/2006 10:31:42 AM
Subject:

Regarding your note below, I did not declare "option 1.5" to be inappropriate for Honolulu. I am not even sure what you mean by "option 1.5."

I did advise Region 9 that conducting a planning Alternatives Analysis does not relieve FTA and the grantee of responsibility to perform scoping in accordance with CEQ regulations and guidance and with the FHWA-FTA guidance on linking planning and NEPA.

Regarding scoping requirements, see:

http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/ceq/1501.htm#1501.7 (CEQ regulation)
http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/scope/scoping.htm (CEQ guidance)
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep/plannepa050222.pdf (FHWA-FTA guidance on linking planning and NEPA)

Subject: NEPA/AA Connections
Location: TPE Conference Rm

Start: Thu 4/27/2006 9:00 AM
End: Thu 4/27/2006 10:00 AM

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Accepted

Required Attendees: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>; Bausch, Carl <FTA>; Libberton, Sean <FTA>; Ossi, Joseph <FTA>; Ryan, James <FTA>; HynesCherin, Brigid <FTA>

This is to discuss implications of section 6002 on whether AAs can be done under NEPA and Joe's recent email declaring option 1.5 to be inappropriate for Honolulu.