**From:** Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
**To:** Sukys, Raymond <FTA>
**CC:** Turchie, Donna <FTA>
**Sent:** 4/17/2006 10:14:28 AM
**Subject:** FW: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project - Clarification to April 6 Scoping Report Comments

Ray:
I think that you did the right thing and so does my boss. Jim Ryan and Ron Fisher do not agree. Under the circumstances, you would have to either: (a) use your own judgment, or (b) appeal to Brigid for a unified TPE position.
Joe

---

**From:** Bausch, Carl <FTA>
**Sent:** Friday, April 14, 2006 2:37 PM
**To:** Fisher, Ronald <FTA>
**Subject:** RE: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project - Clarification to April 6 Scoping Report Comments

Thanks, Ron. In my experience, the reasonableness of an alternative for NEPA purposes depends on the nature of the proposal involved and the facts of each case. I do not think it is necessary at this stage of development to characterize an alternative as "reasonable;" it's simply an alternative that will be examined to determine whether or not it is practical or feasible from a technical and economic standpoint. This will provide the decisionmaker with much more latitude in making its reasonableness determination down the road. This is just one man's view, of course. Thanks again. Carl

---

**From:** Fisher, Ronald <FTA>
**Sent:** Friday, April 14, 2006 1:52 PM
**To:** Bausch, Carl <FTA>
**Subject:** FW: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project - Clarification to April 6 Scoping Report Comments

This is another issue that we need to discuss. It sounds like Joe has told region 9 that once NEPA begins, we cannot exclude analysis of reasonable alternatives. I thought that reasonable alternatives could be screened out during NEPA as long as there was adequate justification for doing so, i.e. using information that has been developed, a credible case can be made for dropping the alternative. If all reasonable alternatives must be fully examined within NEPA, then we have violated that requirement for years by screening out reasonable alternatives in AA.

---

**From:** Ryan, James <FTA>
**Sent:** Friday, April 14, 2006 1:24 PM
**To:** Fisher, Ronald <FTA>
**Subject:** FW: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project - Clarification to April 6 Scoping Report Comments

So, it is risky to label alternatives "reasonable" at the beginning of AA for fear that we can't eliminate them at the end of AA. That sounds as though we've bought in to the FHWA strategy of showing that only the preferred alternative is reasonable – and that all others are unreasonable.

We're back to the same old word games.

---

**From:** Sukys, Raymond <FTA>
**Sent:** Friday, April 14, 2006 1:21 PM
**To:** Ryan, James <FTA>

**Subject:** RE: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project - Clarification to April 6 Scoping Report Comments

Joe was concerned that if the feds are concluding that it is reasonable now, that it would make it more difficult to exclude it once NEPA begins.

---

**From:** Ryan, James <FTA>
**Sent:** Friday, April 14, 2006 10:16 AM
**To:** Sukys, Raymond <FTA>
**Subject:** RE: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project - Clarification to April 6 Scoping Report Comments

Wow. What is this a response to? I thought your original language was just right – a reasonable alternative that ought to be considered in the AA – just like the other reasonable alternatives that they are considering. That's right out of NEPA. I hope they don't apply the "not been proven to be unreasonable" label to Slater's alternative exclusively!

---

**From:** Sukys, Raymond <FTA>
**Sent:** Friday, April 14, 2006 12:45 PM
**To:** Miyamoto, Faith
**Cc:** Ryan, James <FTA>; Barr, James <FTA>; Turchie, Donna <FTA>; scheibe@pbworld.com; Hamayasu, Toru; Marler, Renee <FTA>
**Subject:** Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project - Clarification to April 6 Scoping Report Comments

Hi Faith,

I would like to clarify the second bullet to avoid a possible misunderstanding. Rather than saying that the Slater alternative is reasonable (for inclusion into the AA), I meant to say that the Slater alternative has not been proven to be unreasonable and, therefore, it should be a fully evaluated alternative during the AA. The AA will assess the reasonability of each alternative to determine which may be carried forward into the EIS.

Thank you,

Ray

---

**From:** Sukys, Raymond <FTA>
**Sent:** Thursday, April 06, 2006 3:58 PM
**To:** 'Miyamoto, Faith'
**Cc:** Ryan, James <FTA>; Barr, James <FTA>; Turchie, Donna <FTA>; scheibe@pbworld.com; Hamayasu, Toru; Marler, Renee <FTA>
**Subject:** RE: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project - Scoping Report Comments

Hi Faith,

Here are the FTA comments:

- FHWA and the HDOT comments are missing from the scoping report. Both of these agencies are critical to the success of this effort and both will need to become cooperating agencies.

- The letter from Honolulutraffic.com by Cliff Slater proposes a reasonable alternative, a two-lane reversible, elevated HOT lane highway between the H1/H2 merge near Waikele and Pier 16 near Hilo Hatties. Please confirm that this will be a fully evaluated alternative during the AA using the scope described by the Slater' letter and also indicate that alternative may be carried forward into the EIS.

- There is local concern over the timeline and whether the LPA decision has sufficient time for a proper evaluation. Please adjust the schedule to assure that there is sufficient time for public deliberation prior to the LPA decision.

- As we discussed during the EJ conference call, please schedule another scoping meeting at the start of NEPA. Also, please update your schedule and submit it to Region IX.

Thank you,

Ray

---

**From:** Miyamoto, Faith [mailto:fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov]
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 05, 2006 5:15 PM
**To:** Ryan, James <FTA>; Barr, James <FTA>; Turchie, Donna <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>
**Subject:** Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project - Scoping Report

Hi Everyone –

It will be almost a month since I last checked on the status of your review of the Scoping Report that we sent you in February. Since our submittal of the report, we have distributed two newsletters that have stated that the Scoping Report will be at the project website. After discussing this matter internally, we have decided to post the Scoping Report on the website next week. If you have any comments, please transmit them to me ASAP.

Thanks.

Faith Miyamoto
Department of Transportation Services
City & County of Honolulu
(808) 527-6976
fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov