

Summary of Consulting Party Meeting Comments/Responses
Meeting Date: November 12, 2013
Airport Station Group (ASG) Meeting #1 and Pearl Harbor Station Focus Meeting

PA Consulting Party Review Comments
From ASG Meeting #1

#	Commenter	Comment (These notes reflect general key comments and may not include every statement made.)	HART/FTA Response
1	Historic Hawai'i Foundation	<p>Middle Street Transit Center Station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the relocated Middle Street Station have to go through a full SEIS process; is it consistent with the existing ROD? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that the key issue for the Middle Street Station change was associated with a 404 permit not Section 4(f). FTA clarified that all environmental resources would be examined and that this proposed change was not yet been determined consistent with the ROD.
2	Historic Hawai'i Foundation	<p>Little Makalapa Navy Housing Historic District Boundary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted for the record that the Little Makalapa boundary was not defined yet, that per the PA that this was being updated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The comment was acknowledged.
3	HART	<p>Invitation for Additional Consulting Party Input on Station Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Hawai'i Foundation - noted that some context from Keehi Lagoon Park and Veteran's War Memorial locations could fit for Lagoon Drive Station. Two parties provided HART a list of possible lei types for these stations. NAVFAC Hawai'i, noted transport and sea planes context possibilities for Ke'ehi Lagoon area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invited Consulting Parties to provide information beyond what TCP studies had done, if there were additional contributions from this area. HART noted that input is invited for: column wraps, paving program and ultimately station naming. Three ideas were contributed by consulting parties at the end of the first presentation and were acknowledged by HART.
4	Historic Hawai'i Foundation	<p>Asked about the status of the Context Studies, noting that these would further support the station designs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HART noted that they were in progress and would be available early next year.

#	Commenter	Comment (These notes reflect general key comments and may not include every statement made.)	HART/FTA Response
5	Unidentified Speaker	<p>Landscaping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping inquiry regarding Middle Street Transit Center Station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HART clarified that there would be no landscaping for the Middle Street Transit Center Station since the possible landscaping areas are outside the rail project scope of work. The station footprint is small and on structure over Kalihi Stream and connects to the existing transit center. It is just a drop off location now. In the long term, a parking garage is planned. Middle Street is not a manicured area. Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT) property and a radio antenna are located here. Also Kalihi Stream is natural in that area and HART is obligated not to raise the normal water level.
6	NAVFAC Hawai'i	<p>Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asked if the station design took into account sea level rise related to climate change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HART noted that project is designed for the floodplain.

PA Consulting Party Review Comments From Pearl Harbor Focus Meeting			
#	Commenter	Comment (These notes reflect general key comments and may not include every statement made.)	HART Response
7	Unidentified Speakers – General Discussion Summary	<p>Makalapa Historic Districts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HART and Navy schedules associated with completion of the Makalapa Historic Districts (HD) documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential Results - Two separate HDs or one HD to include both Makalapa housing areas. ○ Potential Status of Pearl Harbor Station - Outside of both HDs as currently shown, or within a combined HD (with either one HD or both HDs) probably as a non-contributing element or previously approved transportation corridor element ○ Given those possibilities, the potential for Section 4(f) issues wouldn't arise in all cases. (Some parties thought that it should be assumed to be subject to Section 4(f).) 	Subsequent to the meeting, HART is developing schedules in collaboration with the Navy.

#	Commenter	Comment (These notes reflect general key comments and may not include every statement made.)	HART Response
8	Unidentified Speakers – General Discussion Summary	<p>NR Update Relationship to Station Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consulting parties discussed whether the NHL/HD nomination processes should be parallel to the station design process or if in fact station design shouldn't be finalized without completion of these processes. Kiersten did not understand why this had taken HART so long; three years had passed since the PA was executed. The consulting parties did not appear to have the background information that was the basis for HART's FEIS/ROD and PE decisions associated with the location of the Pearl Harbor Station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HART noted that there have been a number of meetings with the Navy. Also noted that changing the station location could also impact the vertical alignment of the guideway. HART noted that this had been discussed with the Navy 4-5 years ago and that this is how we got to the conclusion being presented. HART was proceeding based on the knowledge we had; that was included in the FEIS. HART does not see the updating of historic documentation or nomination of historic properties as shaping station design, and the location has already been determined. HART noted that Navy leadership had changed during this time and now there were issues coming up about moving the station and guideway.
9	NAVFAC Hawai'i	<p>ICRMP 2008 versus Mason Architects, Inc. 2003 Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referenced the 2008 Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) as what HART should look at for the last approach to the Makalapa HDs (planning document that combined the HDs) not the August 2003 Historic Context Study of Historic Military Family Housing in Hawaii (which identified separate Makalapa HDs). HD forms are currently being updated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This comment was acknowledged.
10	NAVFAC Hawai'i	<p>Station Functionality and TOD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asked about functionality, how does the station work, how do pedestrians get to the various locations. Inquired about HART's involvement in TOD, parking structures, etc. at Pearl Harbor. NAVFAC Hawai'i asked how to get safe and functional access? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HART explained using various slides.

#	Commenter	Comment (These notes reflect general key comments and may not include every statement made.)	HART Response
11	NAVFAC Hawai'i	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NAVFAC Hawai'i requested that HART provide documentation to show what the Navy had said before. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HART said this was outside the scope of work of the station final design contract. Also, HART noted that TOD in general was the purview of the City Department of Permitting and Planning (DPP), who had authority over development, zoning and building code. • HART noted that 5-6 locations had been considered for this station and an old version had shown entries on both sides. HART indicated that the Navy was involved in the collaboration resulting in keeping the station out of the NHL. The FEIS identified removal of any makai touchdown as a mitigation measure.
12	National Trust for Historic Preservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wanted to know how HART kept these 5-6 options from five years ago secret, including from the Navy. She requested the same information requested by NAVFAC Hawai'i. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HART responded that documentation is, and has been, available. All parties previously involved with the EIS process should have their own documentation.
13	NAVFAC Hawai'i	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The primary concern is that the station access must be safe and functional. NAVFAC Hawai'i felt that this point should be presented at meetings (including public meetings). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HART will research and compile pedestrian traffic information for both the Aloha Stadium and Pearl Harbor Stations. Some was already included in the FEIS.
14	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commented that it would be helpful for everyone to review the safety and pedestrian access studies that were being discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HART noted that there was information in the FEIS and support studies and as HART fine-tuned multi-modal interface/bus-rail integration studies for each station that more updates would be available. Some of this fine-tuning would not be directly relevant to station design, such as specific bus route services, etc.
15	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACHP asked for confirmation of NPS or SHPD attendance at the meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HART noted that SHPD had a conflict and did not send a representative. No one from NPS called in to the meeting.

#	Commenter	Comment (These notes reflect general key comments and may not include every statement made.)	HART Response
16	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	Design Approaches to Pearl Harbor Station <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked for further suggestions for design approaches based on what had been presented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HART asked for input on the presentation; has HART addressed these issues otherwise? [See comments from the Navy below.]
17	NAVFAC Hawai'i	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledged that this was an improved design approach to minimize impacts. NAVFAC Hawai'i still concerned about functionality. Noted that as a concern for both Aloha Stadium and Pearl Harbor Stations. 	
18	NAVFAC Hawai'i	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wanted to know how to get pedestrians safely across the highway if the station remained as is? 	
19	NAVFAC Hawai'i	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that this was a unique station, that would serve shipyard people. How would this work? How would they get across Kamehameha Highway? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HART noted that the traffic signals were HDOT property. Discussion concluded that the Navy and HART should work with HDOT on there issues.