	A	B	C	D
1	**PA Comments and Responses from AIA**			
2				
3	**Number**	**Page in Letter**	**Comment**	**Response**
4	1		AIS and TCP not being done.	The City has completed the AIS for the first segment of work and is underway with the second. The remainder will be addressed as soon as the PA is executed or the Project reaches the affected areas. The TCPs are linked in terms of timing to the PA. An executed PA will precipitate the commencement of such work. The statement that the work should have been done before the AA is wrong. An analysis was done during the AA. Despite the continuing insistence that there is, there is no known 4(f) issue.
5	2		Effects on 33 resources not defined.	The effects report defined the effects on all resources identified by the City and FTA as affected. FTA and the City have requested clarification of the additional adverse effects identified by the SHPD. There has never been a response. They were carried forward in the interest of being inclusive rather than exclusive. This has been true from the beginning of the consultation process and has been discussed in several consulting party meetings.

	A	B	C	D
6	3		APE inconsistently drawn	The APE map has not changed in two years. The inconsistencies noted are simply the fact that the original preferred alignment changed from the Salt Lake alignment to the Airport alignment. The plates were in sequence for the Salt Lake version with the Airport plates shown at the end. Now, the Salt Lake sheets have been removed at the request of consulting parties and the sheet numbers are not sequential, but they are as they have always been. The key map clearly shows how the arrangement works to be consistent with the original APE approvals. There will be changes as the project moves forward. There is a public process specified in the PA. These elements are included to offer access to the consulting parties as the Project proceeds. Concerns about the details in the maps do not affect the substance of the intended APE purpose.
7	4		More consulting parties listed than participated	All invited consulting parties that did not decline consulting party invitation are listed. It was our understanding that this was the preferred approach from ACHP.
8	5		Meeting of the consulting parties	All consulting party comments have been considered. The comments provided by the parties are nearly all repeated comments previously addressed in meetings, so there is no need for an additional meeting.