**From:** Barr, James <FTA>
**To:** Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
**Sent:** 4/13/2006 9:04:19 AM
**Subject:** RE: Honolulu AA - FTA Meeting

the 17th is good.
the 21st we are in planner's seminar.
I am taking the 5th on all AA questions!

---

**From:** Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 12, 2006 9:37 PM
**To:** 'Emerson, Donald'; Ryan, James <FTA>
**Cc:** Bausch, Carl <FTA>; Barr, James <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Turchie, Donna <FTA>
**Subject:** RE: Honolulu AA - FTA Meeting

Please see Questions 5, 6, 8, 12, and 13 of http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep/plannepa050222.pdf, all of which state that, for the results of planning studies to be carried into NEPA, those results must be subjected to public and interagency review and comment during the scoping of the NEPA document.

So-called "option 1.5" is not consistent with CEQ regulations if it consists of a process for scoping the AA study followed by a yearlong planning study (the AA) and then an EIS without any public process for scoping the EIS itself. The problems are that the original scoping process and the EIS process are separated by a year during which the EIS is NOT under development, and the alternatives covered in the EIS are NOT those discussed during that initial scoping. They have been modified or delimited by the AA. For so-called option 1.5 to work, there must be a public/interagency scoping process after the AA and before the EIS, the purpose of which is to determine the scope of the EIS, including alternatives to be covered in the EIS, P&N, impact assessment methodologies and level of detail, etc. The results of a properly conducted AA that is publicly available during NEPA scoping should guide that scoping process, but there are no guarantees, as Question #6 acknowledges.

---

**From:** Emerson, Donald [mailto:Emerson@pbworld.com]
**Sent:** Friday, April 07, 2006 7:59 AM
**To:** Ryan, James <FTA>; Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
**Cc:** Ruegg, Steven; Davidson, William A.; Scheibe, Mark; Hamayasu, Toru; Wellander, Chris A.; Spurgeon, Lawrence
**Subject:** RE: Honolulu AA - FTA Meeting

Jim and Joe,

Prior to the April 28 meeting, I wonder if we might have a conference call to go over some of the NEPA issues that are involved here. You might want to involve Ray Sukys too. The best dates for me would be April 17 and 21. Thanks.

Don

**Donald J. Emerson**
Principal Consultant
PB Consult Inc.
465 Spring Park Place
Herndon, Virginia 20170
(703) 742-5804 (phone and voice mail)

(703) 742-5800 (fax)
(202) 661-5315 (DC office phone)
emerson@pbworld.com

---

**From:** Davidson, William A.
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 10:20 PM
**To:** Jim Ryan (fta) (james.ryan@dot.gov)
**Cc:** Ruegg, Steven; Scheibe, Mark; Hamayasu, Toru; Wellander, Chris A.; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Emerson, Donald
**Subject:** Honolulu AA - FTA Meeting

If possible, we would like to establish a meeting date to discuss the following topics:

- Travel Forecasting Work Elements
  - Review a series of technical memoranda (that will be provided in advance) that cover a range of topics:
    - CTPP Person Trip Comparisons
    - Implementation of Alternative Volume-Delay Functions
    - Analysis of the 1992 On-Board Survey Assignment
    - Computation of Revised Calibration Target Values
    - Parking Cost Representation
    - Highway Travel Time Comparisons
    - Transit Travel Time Comparisons
  - Mode Choice Model Re-Calibration & Validation
  - Managed Lane Alternative Representation & Forecasting Methodology
- Definition of Alternatives
  - No-Action
  - TSM
  - Managed Lane Alternatives (2)
  - Fixed-Guideway Alternatives (4)
- Schedule
  - Completion of AA
  - Draft and Final EIS

Our preferred date is Friday, April 28th. I believe our agenda will require a vast majority of a day. The other options could be the morning of the 26th and/or the morning of the 27th.

---

William A. Davidson
PB Consult Inc.
303 Second Street, Suite 700N
San Francisco, CA 94107
(415) 243-4601
(925) 202-3395 (mobile)

This email and any attachments may be confidential or legally privileged. If you receive this message in error or are not the intended recipient, you should destroy the email message and any attachments or copies, and you are prohibited from retaining, distributing, disclosing or using any information contained herein. Please inform me of the erroneous delivery by return email. Thank you for your cooperation.