

	A	B	C
1	PA Comments and Responses from AIA		
2			
3	Number	Page in Letter	Comment
4	1		AIS and TCP not being done.
5	2		Effects on 33 resources not defined.
6	3		APE inconsistently drawn
7	4		More consulting parties listed than participated
8	5		Meeting of the consulting parties

	D
1	
2	
3	Response
4	<p>The City has completed the AIS for Phase I work and is underway with Phase 2. The remaining two phases (Phases 3 and 4) will be started in accordance with the schedule indicated in the PA . The TCP study also will be completed in accordance with the schedule indicated the PA. This work will begin after the PA has been executed as agreed to during the consultation process. The statement that the work should have been done before the AA is not entirely correct. As discussed during consultation, historic and archaeological resources were considered in the alternatives analysis phase of the Project. In addition, a Section 4(f) Evaluation will be completed during the course of the Project if historic properties or archaeological resources are identified as eligible for inclusion on the NRHP as appropriate.</p>
5	<p>FTA has determined that the Project will have adverse effects to 33 historic resources. Included in these 33 are adverse effect determinations recommended by the SHPO and accepted by FTA. The SHPO did not provide the basis for these determinations. Therefore, general effects to the resources are assumed as provided in the table in Attachment 2 of the PA. This attachment is a summary of information provide in historic resources technical reports and the FEIS.</p>
6	<p>The APE definition has not changed since February 2008 when the SHPO concurred with the City and FTA. The inconsistencies noted are due to the change from from the Salt Lake alignment to the Airport alignment. The original parcel panes were organized showing the Salt Lake first followed by the Airport parcel panes, which were shown at the end of the original mapping. At the request of the consulting parties, the parcel pane maps have been re-sequenced and renumbered. Concerns about the details in the maps do not affect the substance of the intended APE purpose.</p>
7	<p>All invited consulting parties that did not decline consulting party invitations are listed. This was the preferred approach indicated by ACHP.</p>
8	<p>All consulting party comments have been considered during during development of the PA and will continue through its implementation. The consulting parties have been in informed on progress on the PA through emails by FTA since May 2010 and updates provided by other signatories during regular historic preservation calls. As you know, consultation can be more than meetings held in teleconferences. Although, FTA consulted with the SHPD and the ACHP a few times between the consulting party meetings held between November 2009 and May 2010, not many changes to the PA occurred. FTA was more focused during that time period on project concerns adjacent to the airport. Consulting parties have been encouraged to contact FTA if they had any questions and also received a draft of the PA to comment on in the Final EIS. Also, FTA continues to be informed of consulting parties' concerns, which have been relayed to FTA by other signatories or as a result of phone calls and other consultation meetings attended by ACHP. FTA plans to hold a teleconference with the consulting parties in early January 2011 to discuss final comments to the PA.</p>