From: Longo, David <FTA>
To: Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Griffo, Paul <FTA>; Miller, Severn <FTA>
CC: Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Irvin, Wes <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Borinsky, Susan <FTA>; Bausch, Carl <FTA>; Barr, James <FTA>; Fisher, Ronald <FTA>; Biehl, Scott <FTA>; VanWyk, Christopher <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>
Sent: 11/17/2008 8:14:10 AM
Subject: RE: an earlier email

Thanks all for your comments. We have responded by advising the writer to send a letter of inquiry to our Office of Chief Counsel (TCC). TCC is best equipped to coordinate the response with Region 9 and TPE and provide the legal balance needed. Email is NOT the best way to handle this issue.

Dave Longo
Deputy Associate Administrator,
Office of Communications and Congressional Affairs
Federal Transit Administration
1200 New Jersey Ave. SE, E57-304
Washington, DC 20590

Tel: 202-366-0608
Fax: 202-366-3472
Cell: 202-680-9237

From: Sukys, Raymond <FTA>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 12:49 PM
To: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Griffo, Paul <FTA>; Miller, Severn <FTA>
Cc: Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Irvin, Wes <FTA>; Longo, David <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Borinsky, Susan <FTA>; Bausch, Carl <FTA>; Barr, James <FTA>; Fisher, Ronald <FTA>; Biehl, Scott <FTA>; VanWyk, Christopher <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>
Subject: RE: an earlier email

I suggest that we refer Mr. Slater to the DEIS that is currently undergoing public review and suggest that he provide comments about his concerns about logical termini, independent utility, etc. Ray

---

From: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 9:43 AM
To: Griffo, Paul <FTA>; Miller, Severn <FTA>
Cc: Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Irvin, Wes <FTA>; Longo, David <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Borinsky, Susan <FTA>; Bausch, Carl <FTA>; Barr, James <FTA>; Fisher, Ronald <FTA>; Biehl, Scott <FTA>; VanWyk, Christopher <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>
Subject: RE: an earlier email

Shouldn't this inquiry properly be handled by the Office of Planning & Environment or Region IX as these are the office with primary jurisdiction and responsibility, at this point, for the Honolulu rail project?

From: Griffo, Paul <FTA>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 9:02 AM
To: Griffo, Paul <FTA>; Miller, Severn <FTA>
Cc: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Irvin, Wes <FTA>; Longo, David <FTA>
Subject: RE: an earlier email

Per Wes's recommendation, I will ask the group to send a letter to FTA Office of the Chief Counsel.

From: Griffo, Paul <FTA>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 10:37 AM

To: Miller, Severn <FTA>
Cc: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Irvin, Wes <FTA>; Longo, David <FTA>
Subject: FW: an earlier email

Sev,

Now that the referendum has passed, how do you recommend we respond to this inquiry?

The group, www.honolulutraffic.com says their mission is offering cost effective ways to reduce traffic congestion on Oahu, and they are decidedly anti-rail.

Thanks.

Paul

From: Cliff Slater [mailto:cslater36@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 7:48 AM
To: Griffo, Paul <FTA>
Subject: Fwd: an earlier email

Mr. Griffo:

I omitted to add that our query below is being made in response to your issuance this month of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project.

Cliff Slater
Cell: 808.285.7799

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Cliff Slater** <cslater36@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Nov 15, 2008 at 6:20 PM
Subject: an earlier email
To: Paul.Griffo@dot.gov

Mr. Griffo:

Would you be so kind as to confirm that you have received an email we sent you approximately last Sunday, November 9, with a question about the Honolulu Project as shown below.

Thank you,

Cliff Slater
Chair, Honolulutraffic.com
cell phone: 808.285.7799

"We note that construction of phase I of the Honolulu Project will commence prior to FTA's approval of the FFGA. Please explain why that does not violate the following provisions of 23CFR771:

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep/23cfr771.htm

In order to ensure meaningful evaluation of alternatives and to avoid commitments to transportation improvements before they are fully evaluated, the action evaluated in each EIS or finding of no significant impact (FONSI) shall:

1. Connect logical termini and be of sufficient length to address environmental matters on a broad scope;

2. Have independent utility or independent significance, i.e., be usable and be a reasonable expenditure even if no additional transportation improvements in the area are made; and

3. Not restrict consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements."